

MR 1549

James White Library
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
Berrien Springs, MI 49104

An
Examination
OF
Forty Fatal Errors
REGARDING
The Atonement

A Review of a Work which "Fully Explains the
Sanctuary Question as understood by the
(Seventh-day Adventist) Denomination"

THE LIBRARY
S.D.A. Theological Seminary

BY A. F. BALLENGER
AUTHOR OF

Takoma Park
Washington 12, D.C.

"POWER FOR WITNESSING"
"CAST OUT FOR THE CROSS OF CHRIST"
AND
"THE PROCLAMATION OF LIBERTY"
AND "THE UNPARDONABLE SIN"

20602

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR
RIVERSIDE, CALIF.

Price, 15c ; 2 or more, 10c each

Preface

Early in 1905, the writer received a letter from the President of the British Union Conference, citing him to appear before the Conference soon to convene, and answer to the charge of entertaining error regarding the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. Three secret sessions were held in the early morning, of one hour each, at which time the Executive Committee listened to the writer's defence of his position. No one was chosen to reply; no one attempted to show from the Scriptures that the positions were incorrect.

"Then you admit that this teaching is contrary to the doctrine of the denomination on these points?" An affirmative reply settled the matter in the minds of the trial jury.

A resolution was introduced and passed in the conference, in the absence of the defendant, deposing him from the position of superintendent of the Irish field, and putting Eld. E. E. Andross in the place.

The President next wrote the action of the conference to the former superintendent of the Irish field, Eld. Wm. Hutchinson. He replied, protesting against the action, and saying in substance that "the Irish brethren had something to say in accepting Bro. Ballenger as Superintendent of the field and they ought to have something to say at his rejection.

This brought a majority of the Executive Committee to Belfast with the unanimous request that the defendant appeal the case to the General Conference soon to convene at Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.

This brought protest from other members, but the brother was firm in his position. He said:

When I quote the Bible to prove my position, if you quote the Testimonies against it, I am expected to yield my understanding of the Word to the interpretation given by Sister White. I therefore insist that in this denomination the Testimonies are above the Bible, and I am opposed to accepting Bro. Ballenger as a member.

As the result of the brother's objection, action upon the matter was deferred until the next Sabbath. In the meantime, as the result of influences brought to bear by members of the General Conference, we were rejected.

As the reader examines the positions of the writer, let him remember that for believing these things, he was cast out of office, cast out of the ministry, and with his companion, cast out of the church, and rejected, when on invitation, application was made for membership; and all this before he had ever publicly taught these things either by voice or pen.

Eld. Andross, the author of the denomination's reply, has been frank to acknowledge that the brethren did not meet the positions presented by the writer, and that he was not then able to meet them. However, after five years of study, he believes he has found a reply. It is only fair to state that some of the leading brethren have condemned his book, as containing more errors than "Cast Out" which it is supposed to refute. And the question is now farther from being settled than it was eight years ago.

This new pamphlet which is advertised in the Sabbath School Quarterly as a work, which "fully explains the sanctuary question as understood by the denomination" is squarely contradicted on some points by the Quarterly.

And now since the leaders cannot agree, let the common people take their Bibles, and like the noble Bereans, search the Scriptures diligently and prayerfully, to know for themselves what is truth.

Partial List of Errors Examined

The teaching:

1.

That the dedication of the earthly sanctuary pointed to the dedication of the heavenly, is an error. See page 10.

2.

That "By His own blood He entered in once into the holy place" (sanctuary) and similar scriptures, refer only to a ceremony of dedicating the heavenly sanctuary, is an error. See page 12.

3.

That the scripture "When He had offered one sacrifice for sin forever, sat down on the right hand of God," and similar expressions of the book of Hebrews, is limited to the death of Christ, is an error. See page 20.

4.

That Christ offered one sacrifice for sins forever before He became priest, is an error. See page 19.

5.

That the way was not "opened into the heavenly sanctuary," and that heaven was not "accessible to man" before Christ died, is an error. See page 24.

6.

That no mercy was ministered from the heavenly sanctuary for 4,000 years, is an error. See page 24.

7.

That the only sanctuary from which mercy was ministered to the human race for 4,000 years, was the shadowy sanctuary made with hands, is an error. See page 38.

8.

That the earthly sanctuary was God's real dwelling place, is an error. See page 34.

9.

That the terrible throne of God seen in vision by Isaiah and Ezekiel, was the throne that dwelt in the earthly sanctuary, is an error. See page 28.

I.

10.

That Hebrews 9:8 teaches that the heavenly sanctuary was closed while the earthly sanctuary stood, is an error. See page 40.

11.

That the symbol of God's glory dwelt in the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary, is an error. See page 53.

12.

That the term "tabernacle of the congregation," or "tent of meeting" (Revised Version) of Lev. 1:1, Ex. 29:42, 43; and 30:36, refers to the first apartment of the sanctuary, is an error. See page 53.

13.

That Rev. 4:2 teaches that God moved His throne from the holy of holies into the first apartment at the ascension of Christ, where He abode for eighteen centuries, is an error. See page 61.

14.

That the "thrones" of Dan. 7:9 refer to the thrones of the Father and the Son, is an error. See page 63.

15.

That twenty-four elders seen around the throne, proves that the throne is in the first apartment, is an error. See page 64.

16.

That the seven golden candlesticks seen by John, prove that Christ was ministering in the first apartment, is an error. See page 68.

17.

That because Christ is seen wearing a golden girdle, He is ministering in the first apartment, is an error. See page 69.

18.

That because the seven lamps and the golden altar are seen before the throne, therefore the throne is in the first apartment, is an error. See page 71.

19.

That because the ark of the testament is seen, therefore God's throne is moved back into the holy of holies, is an error. See page 71.

20.

That Christ does not offer His blood at the mercy seat to make atonement for sin until the seventh trumpet sounds, is an error. See page 73.

21.

That the "mystery of God" is finished **after** the seventh trumpet sounds, is an error. See page 72.

II.

22.

That the seventh trumpet began to sound in 1844 is an error. See page 72.

23.

That the vision of the ark of the testament belongs to the vision of the seven trumpets, is an error. See page 74.

24.

That angels cannot act as priests, is an error. See page 76.

25.

That the Lord's goat slain on the day of atonement, did not represent Christ as sin-bearer, is an error. See page 101.

26.

That the violated law is satisfied with the blood of one who is not a sin-bearer, is an error. See page 106.

27.

That the blood of Christ is divided into two parts, "sin-laden" and "sinless," is an error. See page 101.

28.

That Christ defiled the heavenly sanctuary with his "sin-laden" blood from the cross to 1844 and cleanses it with his "sinless" blood from 1844 onward, is an error. See page 102.

29.

That blood is used in the Scriptures to represent sin, is an error. See page 108.

30.

That Christ makes atonement only for confessed sins, is an error. See page 104.

31.

That the expression "to make reconciliation for iniquity" does not refer to Christ's atonement for sin at the mercy-seat, is an error. See page 97.

32.

That the terms "reconciliation" and "atonement" apply to different phases of the plan of salvation, is an error. See page 99.

33.

That the many offerings of the common priests before the veil, pointed forward to many offerings which Christ would make before the veil, is an error. See page 80.

34.

That it was not fitting that God's throne should dwell above the sacred ark from the cross to 1844, is an error. See page 90.

III.

35.

That the throne of God is too movable to dwell in the holy of holies from the cross to 1844, but not too movable to dwell in the first apartment during that time, is an error. See page 91.

36.

That the Pentecostal baptism was the antetype of the glory that filled the earthly sanctuary at its dedication is an error. See page 115.

37.

That the Pentecostal baptism was the announcement that Christ had offered the first of a long series of offerings covering eighteen centuries is an error. See page 115.

38.

That the Pentecostal baptism was the announcement that Christ had taken the place of sin-bearing and condemnation before the veil, which in the type separated the priest from the token of God's presence, is an error. See page 117.

39.

That the Pentecostal baptism was the announcement that God had abandoned the ark and law, and taken up His abode in the first apartment, there to dwell for eighteen centuries, separated by a veil from the law and mercy-seat, is an error. See page 117.

40.

That Christ was glorified, exalted above every name that is named, and clothed with all power in heaven and in earth, eighteen centuries before He had satisfied the demands of the law, for His life as the sinner's substitute, is an error. See page 117.

An
Examination
OF
Forty Fatal Errors
REGARDING
The Atonement

IT is gratifying to note that this new book, "which fully explains the sanctuary question as understood by the denomination," takes the position that "within the veil" of Heb. 6:19, 20, does refer to the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary, and does teach that Christ entered there at His ascension.

This will doubtless astonish many in the denomination, ministers and people, who have believed the old position as taught by the pioneers for sixty years, and published in the books of the denomination, and supported by Sister White. And none will be more astonished than those ministers and people who have been cast out of the churches for believing what the denomination now publishes as its position on this scripture.

What astonishes the writer most is that this new position is published without a hint that the author, Eld. E. E. Andross, or the denomination ever published or taught any other position. This new book says:

Much stress is laid, by the author of "Cast Out," upon the expression, "*within the veil*," as found in Heb. 6, 19, 20, fifteen pages of the pamphlet being devoted exclusively to an effort to prove that this means within the second veil or most holy apartment of the heavenly sanctuary.

A More Excellent Ministry, page 52.

By this it is intimated that this fifteen-page effort was entirely unnecessary. The author then proceeds to take the same position, just as if he and the denomina-

tion for whom he speaks, had always held and taught that same position. However the facts are that they have always taught the contrary position, and, during the last eight years, condemned and cast out scores of those who believe this new position.

It is impossible to believe that there was not some one in the many councils held to consider the manuscript of this new pamphlet during its year of rejections and revisions, who had honesty of heart and courage of conviction sufficient to raise some of the following questions. I shall presume that there was, and that his questions were somewhat as follows:

Question. Why are we making this change in the denomination's position? For sixty years we have believed and taught that "within the veil" of Heb. 6:19, 20, refers to the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary.

Answer. Because we cannot maintain the old position from the Scriptures. The Scriptures are positively against it.

Q. And has the denomination only just found this out? And how did the denomination happen to find it out just now?

A. No doubt Bro. Ballenger and his friends would say that it was the result of their agitation of the question.

Q. Would it not be the truth?

A. Possibly.

Q. I remember how Bro. Ballenger, for one solid hour, stood before us, when he was brought to trial over this matter, and read scripture after scripture to prove that "within the veil" of Heb. 6:19, 20, pointed to the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. I remember that we then opposed this position and regarded him and Eld. Wm. Hutchinson, who was on trial with him, as sadly in the dark and as having been led captive by Satan. And after having turned them out with scores of their brethren, for believing what

they taught, are we now going to adopt their position and publish it to the world as our position?

A. But we are not adopting all of Bro. Ballenger's conclusions from this scripture.

Q. But you are adopting the two principal positions that he advocated and based on this scripture. First, that the scripture refers to the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary, and second, that it teaches that Christ went there at His ascension. Is this not true?

A. Yes. But we do not believe that Christ remained in that apartment, but that He and the Father immediately moved into the first apartment where they remained till 1844.

Q. But on the two points mentioned, you now agree with Bro. Ballenger and his brethren.

A. Yes.

Q. And you now believe that in publishing these new positions you are publishing the truth?

A. Yes.

Q. Then you now believe that in publishing the old position for sixty years, the denomination has been publishing error?

A. Yes.

Q. And you believe that when Eld. Daniells and other of the leading brethren went from camp-meeting to camp-meeting teaching the people that "within the veil" of this scripture referred to the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, and taught that Christ entered there at His ascension, they were teaching error, were they not?

A. Yes we presume they were.

Q. When Bro. Ballenger was standing before us on trial for his life as a minister, when he taught with all the earnestness of his soul that "within the veil" of Heb. 6:19, 20, referred to the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary, and taught that Christ went there at His ascension, he was teaching the truth, was he not?

A. Yes, it appears so now.

Q. And in opposing him then, on these points, we were fighting the truth, were we not?

A. It now appears that we were.

Q. Is God with the man who is teaching the truth?

A. Yes.

Q. Then was He not with Bro. Ballenger when we were against him on these points?

A. It would seem so.

Q. Was God with us in opposing the truth on these points?

A. It would seem not.

Q. Then are we not face to face with the solemn fact that we cast out men who were on these points, at least, teaching the truth, while we were fighting that same truth, and teaching error instead?

A. If we would frankly state the truth, we would have to answer, yes.

Q. But how did it happen that we came to admit the evident meaning of this scripture after opposing its plain statement for sixty years; and for eight years casting out brethren and sisters who accepted its plain statement?

A. The fact is, we have just discovered that we can admit that Christ did go into the holy of holies, "within the veil" and still save the cause.

Q. Would we have admitted the evident meaning of the text if we had not seen how we could do it and save the cause?

A. Probably not.

Q. Then when God speaks to us in His Word, is it our rule not to accept His plain statement unless we can do so and save the cause?

A.

Q. Would it not appear that for sixty years we have been saving the cause by opposing the truth and teaching error?

A. Yes, on this one point.

Q. I notice in the manuscript that these new posi-

tions are presented just as if the denomination had always taught them and not fought them. One would gather that the author of "Cast Out" was wasting time and space in using fifteen pages of his pamphlet to prove that "within the veil" is the second apartment, since all believe it. Is this an honorable way to deal with so serious a matter? Shall we fight the truth for sixty years, shall we cast out brethren and sisters for teaching it, and then accept that same truth, publish it to the world, and pretend that we always taught it, and appear surprised that anyone should teach otherwise? Is this the Christian way to deal with this matter?

A. Well, what should we do?

Q. What should we do! Do what any honest man would do who has been fighting the truth for years and then accepts it. Acknowledge our error.

A. But if we acknowledge our mistake on this point, it will weaken our influence with the people. They will be in danger of thinking that we may be in error on other points, and Bro. B. and his brethren, right.

Q. Well, would their thinking so be wrong, in view of the facts? But do you think that the people are ignorant of what we have taught all these years? Do they not have the books in their homes that teach the old error? And will we be able to deceive the people into believing that we are infallible when they have the evidence in print that we are not? Can we expect to sell to the people this new book as the denomination's position on this question, and expect them to forget what is in the books which we have sold them, which contradict the new positions in this new book? Are we not presuming too much on the ignorance of our people?

A. We do not think it wise to confess that we made a mistake.

Q. I note in the introduction that the author promises to deal with the subject by "confining the discussion

to the Bible itself," and then devotes all but ten lines of the first chapter to quotations from Sister White.

A. His MS. was once sent back to him with the request that he omit quotations from Sister White and prove all his positions from the Scriptures only.

Q. Then why has he not done it?

A. We do not know.

Q. When he professes to quote Sister White's position on the subject, why does he suppress a part, which, if quoted, would plainly contradict his position?

A. What has he suppressed?

Q. He has suppressed the following:

Thither the faith of Christ's disciples followed Him as He ascended from their sight. Here [in the first apartment] their hopes centered, "which hope we have," said Paul, "as an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest forever." Heb. 6:19, 20. Great Controversy, pp. 420, 421.

(If this quotation had not been suppressed it would have appeared on page 19 of the new pamphlet, between the last two paragraphs.)

Q. Can you not see that he suppresses these lines because they contradict the position he takes that "within the veil" of Heb. 6:19, 20, does refer to the second apartment? Here Sister White plainly applies this scripture to the first apartment; while he, in this manuscript, applies it to the second. Is it fair for us to condemn and cast out others for teaching contrary to the writings of Sister White, and then teach contrary to her writings ourselves; and then to hide our contradiction, suppress a portion of a quotation which reveals that contradiction? And shall this denomination endorse such methods by publishing this manuscript? Shall we publish this manuscript which promises to deal with the subject from the Bible only, and then cunningly supports our position with nine pages from the works of Sister White, leaving out such matter as contradicts a part of our position? Must we resort to such

tactics to save the cause? Is it any worse for Bro. Ballenger to publish that which contradicts Sister White's teachings than it is for us? Shall we deliberately contradict her teaching in a book which we publish, to prove that the brethren are in error in contradicting her teaching? There is a loud murmur among the common people to the effect that we ourselves do not believe Sister White's writings on some points, and that we use them only to keep control over the people. Will not this book, which takes a position contrary to Sister White's writings, and then suppresses a quotation that would reveal the contradiction, be evidence enough that the brethren's criticism is correct?

THE NEW POSITION EXAMINED

And now that the denomination has surrendered the old position held for sixty years, and taken a new one unknown to the pioneers, let us examine the new one as presented in this new denominational pamphlet.

Likewise before the heavenly sanctuary was opened for service, the new covenant was ratified by the blood of Christ, and the sanctuary, with all that pertains to its ministry, were solemnly dedicated to the sacred purpose to which they were henceforth to be devoted. "By His own blood He entered in once into the holy place."

A further study of the dedication of the earthly sanctuary will help us to understand when the new covenant sanctuary was dedicated and opened for service. . . . And inasmuch as the thought is clearly emphasized in the book of Hebrews, that "*by his own blood*" Christ entered the holy places, it is certainly reasonable to conclude that Christ Himself dedicated the heavenly sanctuary. . . . Therefore, it was necessary for Moses to pass "*within the veil*" to sprinkle the sacred ark. *And this was done before the regular service began in the first apartment.*

Then we conclude that this service, being a type of the dedication of the heavenly sanctuary, was performed at the time indicated in the prophecy of Daniel; that Christ Himself became the "Anointed One" at the time appointed; and that before entering upon His work as High Priest in the first apartment, He sprinkled with His own precious blood the heavenly sanctuary, and the vessels of ministry, and in

this ceremony [italics mine] He first of all entered "*within the veil*" to anoint the ark of the testimony.

Much stress is laid, by the author of "Cast Out," upon the expression "*within the veil*" as found in Heb. 6:19, 20, fifteen pages of the pamphlet being devoted exclusively to an effort to prove that it means within the second veil or most holy apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. Hence it is asserted that at His ascension, Christ began His ministry in the second apartment of the sanctuary instead of the first. This is one of the principal arguments relied upon to support the view advanced.

By the study of the record of the dedication of the earthly sanctuary, it is very apparent that Moses passed "*within the veil*" and poured the holy anointing oil upon the ark of the testament and also sprinkled the blood of consecration upon it before the regular services in the sanctuary began. In like manner, Christ, after making His offering on Calvary, passed "*within the veil*" of the heavenly sanctuary and anointed the ark of the testament, and with His own blood performed the service of consecration.

Following the work of consecration performed by Moses, the high priest, "who served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things," began his yearly round of service in the first apartment of the sanctuary. In like manner, following the consecration of the heavenly sanctuary, our great High Priest began His work in the first apartment.

The dedication of the holy of holies—the sprinkling of the blood of the covenant upon the sacred ark—was the pledge that the work of atonement begun in the holy place would be completed on the great day of atonement, by the sprinkling of the blood of the Lord's goat on the mercy-seat, and the removal of the sins of Israel from the sanctuary. Likewise, the entrance of Christ "*within the veil*," and the sprinkling of the blood of the everlasting covenant, constituted a pledge that He would surely complete the great work of atonement in the holy of holies in the investigative judgment, to begin at the end of the twenty-three hundred years of Dan. 8:14, or in 1844.

Whenever a penitent sinner brought his offering, and in figure transferred his sin through the blood to the sanctuary, he looked forward to the time when the high priest would pass "*within the veil*," with the blood of the Lord's goat, and cleanse the sanctuary. Yea, more; by faith looking beyond the type to the antitype, he saw his great High Priest in the judgment, blotting his sin from the books of record. His hope was anchored to that "*within the veil*." The blood of the new covenant, sprinkled in the holy of holies by our

Forerunner, constitutes an assurance that He will complete His ministry in that apartment by blotting out from the books of record all the sins of the overcomer, and by confessing his name before the Father and before the angels. *A More Excellent Ministry*, pp. 42, 43, 51-54.

This extended quotation is presented to the reader:

First. To show how completely the denomination has changed its views on the term "within the veil" of Heb. 6:19, 20, now teaching that it applies to the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary after opposing that view for sixty years; and,

Second. To show that it now believes with those whom it has cast out, that this scripture teaches that Christ at His ascension did go into the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary. And,

Third. That He did sprinkle His blood, the blood of the everlasting covenant, on the mercy-seat, in the holy of holies; BUT,

Fourth. That all this was but a "ceremony" connected with Christ's "consecration" of the heavenly sanctuary, and was done "before entering upon His work as High Priest in the first apartment." And,

Fifth. That such scriptures as, "By His own blood He entered in once into the holy place (sanctuary) having obtained eternal redemption for us;" (Heb. 9:11, 12), refer only to the "ceremony" of dedicating or consecrating the heavenly sanctuary, which "ceremony" was performed "before entering upon His work as High Priest in the first apartment."

O reader! Can you not see that this new position cuts the heart out of the glorious gospel of a finished work as presented in the Epistle to the Hebrews? Can you not see that such blessed gospel announcements as these: "After He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God;" and "For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified;" and "Their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more;" and "Now where remission of these is there is no more offering for sin;"

(Heb. 10:12, 14, 17, 18)—Can you not see that this blessed gospel is whittled down to a mere “ceremony” connected with the consecration of the heavenly sanctuary, a “ceremony” which, we are told, Christ performs before entering upon His work as High Priest in the first apartment?

THE DEDICATION NOT TYPICAL

The keystone of this arch of errors is that the dedication of the earthly sanctuary was a type of the dedication of the heavenly sanctuary.

Reader, tell me why the work of building the earthly sanctuary could not point forward to the building of the heavenly sanctuary. Answer: Because the heavenly sanctuary was built at least twenty-five hundred years before the earthly was built.

For the same reason the dedication of the earthly sanctuary to be the shadowy dwelling place of God, could not point forward to the dedication of the heavenly sanctuary to be His real dwelling-place, for the simple reason that God had already been dwelling there for at least twenty-five hundred years.

Again, the earthly sanctuary was dedicated to be the symbolical dwelling-place of God as soon as it was built. This new position has the heavenly sanctuary dedicated at least four-thousand years *after* it was built.

The earthly sanctuary was dedicated to be the dwelling-place of God's shadowy throne before the symbol of His glory ever abode therein.

This new position has the heavenly sanctuary dedicated, after God had been dwelling therein, at least four-thousand years.

“Hallow it” and “it shall be holy” was the command to Moses concerning the dedication of the earthly sanctuary.

Did God's holy habitation, “the high and holy place,” which had been indwelt by the “Holy One” for at least

forty centuries, need to be hallowed that it should be holy?

Again, the dedication of the earthly sanctuary was no part of the yearly service which typified the plan of salvation. If it had been, the sanctuary would have had to be dedicated *every year*. The glory would have had to depart from the sanctuary, the sanctuary would then have been dedicated; whereupon the glory would have returned to dwell upon the mercy-seat.

Several times were the sanctuary and the temple dedicated, but only when a new one was built or an old one defiled.

But does not Heb. 9:15-23 teach that the dedication of the earthly sanctuary was a type of the dedication of the heavenly? No indeed.

Paul is here proving the necessity of Christ's shedding His blood that He might offer it to God in the heavenly sanctuary. The Jews denied then, as they do today, that their Messiah must die; and the Apostle is proving that without the shedding of blood there can be no remission. In doing this he refers to the use of blood in general in connection with the old covenant, and in connection with the Levitical law, and sums up his evidence by saying, "and almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission."

The term "by the law" covers all cleansing and all remitting of sin including the work of the day of atonement. And that he had in mind the yearly remission in the most holy place, is clearly proven by what follows, which reads thus:

For Christ is not entered into the holy places [sanctuary] made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that He should offer Himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place [sanctuary] *every year* with the blood of others; for then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.

The dedication of the earthly sanctuary had nothing to do with putting away sin. The sanctuary was not yet occupied. No service had as yet been conducted in it. No blood had been sprinkled upon it in connection with the sacrifice; therefore, according to the author's own position, it was not yet defiled by sin, for, as stated, there had been no ministry by which alone, he tells us, sin was carried into and defiled the sanctuary. Therefore, I repeat, the dedication of the earthly sanctuary had nothing to do with the service which was a type of the putting away of sin.

But thank the Lord, the scriptures quoted above, with the rest of the book of Hebrews, deal with the glorious and gracious work of putting away of sin, and not with a mere "ceremony" of "dedication" which had nothing to do with putting away sin.

The question at issue in this new, denominational position is now squarely before us. The denomination now teaches with us that chapters six, nine and ten, of Hebrews, do say that Christ entered into the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary at His ascension, and sprinkled His blood, the blood of the everlasting covenant, upon the mercy-seat above the law. But the denomination now teaches that all this was but a "ceremony" by which the mercy-seat and the sanctuary were "dedicated to the sacred purpose to which they were henceforth to be devoted:" that it was the antitype of the dedication of the earthly sanctuary, which dedication was no part of the work of the putting away of sin, but was a mere "ceremony" performed before any sin-cleansing service had begun anywhere in the sanctuary.

The denomination teaches that the epistle to the Hebrews deals only with a mere preliminary dedicatory "ceremony." But we know that it deals with the great and final atonement for sin which was typified in the earthly sanctuary by the going in "once every year" by

the high priest, with blood which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people.

O reader! Can you not see that the heart-truth of Hebrews is *not* "ceremony," but salvation from sin?

SALVATION FROM SIN, NOT "CEREMONY"

For when God made promise to Abraham, because He could swear by no greater, He swore by Himself, saying, surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. Vs. 13, 14.

Here the apostle quotes only the introductory words of the promise, and stops the quotation where there is not even a comma. He knew his readers were familiar with the whole promise which is found in Gen. 22: 15, 18. The gospel heart of this oath-bound promise is in these words which follow: "And in thy seed," ["which is Christ," Gal. 3:16,] shall all the nations of the earth be blest."

This oath-confirmed promise was not dependent on anything that man should do. No man of all the nations was ever asked to make any promises to God as a basis for this promise to him. What God promised to do He has done; as we see from Paul's letter to the Galatians, where this same promise is the basis of the apostle's great sermon on salvation by grace and not by works. Listen to that sermon a moment:

The scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. . . . Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the spirit through faith." Gal. 3:8, 13, 14.

This scripture plainly tells us that God's oath-confirmed promise to bless all nations in Christ, was fulfilled on the cross when Christ bore the curse of law-breaking of all nations, which is sin; that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles ("all nations") through Christ Jesus.

The advocates of salvation by works, in Paul's day, attempted, (as they do today), to make this promise of God depend on man's law-keeping. They made the promise read: "In thee and thy seed shall all nations be blessed if they keep the law." Against this grace-destroying amendment to God's promise, Paul hurls the lightning of his divine logic thus:

Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four-hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance [of the blessing] be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Gal. 3:15-18.

Now this is the promise that is under consideration in Heb. 6, and with this blessed truth in mind, let us study it further.

Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, [His purpose to bless all nations in Christ] confirmed it with an oath. That by two immutable things in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us: [in the promise] which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest forever after the order of Melchisedec.

In this scripture the oath-bound promise of God to bless all nations by redeeming them from the curse of the law, by being made a curse for them and dying under that curse on the tree, is connected with Christ's going in as High Priest, within the veil of the heavenly sanctuary, "for us."

It was at the mercy-seat, "within the veil" that Christ sprinkled His curse-cleansing blood and obtained eternal redemption for us, in fulfilment of the oath-confirmed promise of God.

O reader! You are an heir of this oath-confirmed promise of God to bless all nations. And God has blessed you. "He hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." Christ, your High Priest, has entered "within the veil" and offered His sin-cleansing blood on the mercy-seat for you. Is there not in this blessed truth "strong encouragement" for you to lay hold on this, the sinner's hope, so plainly set before you? O why do men try to reduce this blood-bought eternal salvation to a mere formal, lifeless "ceremony?"

Not only does the book under review make Heb. 5:19, 20, to be only a dedicatory "ceremony," but it makes Heb. 9 and 10 apply to the same ceremony; a ceremony which was performed before God had even by the symbol of His presence entered the sanctuary,—before even the ministry in the first apartment had begun,—yes, even before the priests, who performed the ministry, had been anointed.

Keep in mind, as we consider Heb. 9 and 10, that the "ceremony" of dedication had nothing to do with sin according to the author's own position. For before sin could defile the sanctuary, his book tells us, it must be confessed and carried into the sanctuary in the blood, by the priest. And as yet no such ministry had been performed.

In the scriptures under consideration, the burden of the message is, what Christ has done *once* on behalf of sinners in the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary.

We no longer have to labor to convince the denomination that these chapters like chapter six are dealing with the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary, as we have had to do for eight years; for this is now conceded by the denomination in this new book. Our task now is to show that these chapters deal with eternal salvation from sin, accomplished by the sprinkling of the blood of the everlasting covenant upon the mercy-seat above the broken law; and not with a mere

dedicatory "ceremony" performed there to make God's holy habitation holy, and to dedicate God's throne and His dwelling-place, to the work of saving sinners.

"ONE OFFERING," "ONCE OFFERED"

The first five verses of chapter nine introduce the earthly sanctuary, name its two apartments, and name the furniture in each. The next two verses describe the ministry in these two apartments. The object of all this is to get before the reader the "once every year" offering which the high priest offered for the putting away of sin in the second apartment. And this he does that he may show how Christ "ONCE appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself."

That this may appear clear, this scripture with those that follow, in which Paul makes the application to Christ's work, will be brought together that the reader may see the vital gospel truth that the apostle is presenting.

Before doing this I wish to endorse the statement of the book under review, that the words "holy place," "holy places," "holiest," "holiest of all" and "sanctuary" used in this epistle are from the same Greek word; and could be translated "sanctuary" in every instance, as in Heb. 8:1, and 13:11, as they are in some versions.

Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the high priest alone ONCE EVERY YEAR not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people: . . . But Christ being come an high priest of the good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, . . . neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in ONCE into the holy place, [sanctuary] having obtained eternal redemption for us . . . For Christ is not entered into the holy places [sanctuary] made with hands, which are figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that He should offer Himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place [sanctuary] EVERY YEAR with the blood of others;

for then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now ONCE in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And as it is appointed unto men ONCE to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was ONCE offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time without sin unto salvation. Heb. 9:6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 24, 28.

Then said He, Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that He may establish the second. By the which will we have been sanctified [Revised Version] through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ ONCE for all. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man, after He had offered ONE sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God. . . . For by ONE offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. Whereof the holy ghost also is a witness to us; for after He had said before, this is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is NO MORE OFFERING FOR SIN. Heb. 10:9-18.

Reader, be honest with God and with His Word, and with your own heart; do not these scriptures clearly teach, that, as the high priest "*once* every year" entered into the second apartment and offered one sacrifice at the mercy-seat; so Christ entered in ONCE into the true sanctuary and offered ONE sacrifice for sins forever? Do you believe that all this is but a description of a "ceremony" of dedication, performed by Christ in the heavenly sanctuary before the services began in the first apartment of that sanctuary, as we are told, and had nothing to do with putting away of sin?

Look at it again. As "the high priest" "went" "into the second" (or holy of holies) "ONCE every year" "with blood" "which he offered for the errors of the people," so "Christ being come high priest" "by His own blood entered in ONCE into the holy place, [sanctuary], having obtained eternal redemption for us." And "after He had offered ONE sacrifice for sins

forever, sat down on the right hand of God; For by ONE offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." "By which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ ONCE for all." "For ONCE in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." "The Holy Ghost also is a witness" to this truth, that, "by ONE offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified;" for the new covenant promise "and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more," has been fulfilled by the "ONE offering," of Christ "ONCE offered" "for sins forever," which "put away sin." "Now where remission [forgiveness] of these is [the sins mentioned in the new covenant], there remaineth NO MORE OFFERING for sin."

O Brother Andross, and brethren of the Book Committee and of the denomination! How dare you in the face of all this array of plain scripture—how dare you apply all this atoning work of Christ at the mercy-seat, "in the presence of God" "within the veil" to the mere "ceremony" of dedicating the "heavenly sanctuary and the vessels of ministry" "to the sacred purpose to which they are *henceforth* to be *devoted!*"

Reader, the truth taught in the above scriptures is what I and my cast-out brethren teach, as the great principles underlying the plan of salvation. The book under review says that this teaching is "subversive of the great principles underlying the plan of salvation."

Must we cease to teach the blessed truth stated in these scriptures, and teach that the epistle to the Hebrews deals only with a "ceremony" of dedication by which the heavenly sanctuary and the vessels of ministry were dedicated to the work of saving sinners to which they were "henceforth to be devoted?"

If we taught this, we certainly would be teaching that which is "subversive of the great principles of truth underlying the plan of salvation."

Of that which we have written, this is the sum: The dedication of the earthly sanctuary was not a type of the dedication of the heavenly; and the book of Hebrews is *not* an account of the "ceremony of dedicating the heavenly sanctuary;" but a record of the offering of the blood of Christ "ONCE for all" at the mercy-seat, on behalf of the sinning world.

DID CHRIST OFFER HIS ONE AND ONLY SACRIFICE BEFORE BEING MADE PRIEST?

Not only does the denomination now teach in this new book that this one offering offered once for all to God at the mercy-seat, was only a "ceremony" performed by Christ "before the sanctuary was open" "for service,"—"before entering upon His work as High Priest in the first apartment," but it teaches that all this was done *before He was even made a high priest!*

Reader, no doubt this last statement will appear to you so utterly unreasonable and unscriptural that you are unwilling to believe it. But it is the teaching of this new denominational book as the following will prove:

The time when Christ was made a high priest is still further established by the 110th Psalm, the third verse of which reads thus:

"The Lord said unto my lord, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool."

The Psalmist continues: * * * "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." Ps. 110:2-4.

The time when this scripture applies is made clear by a comment of the writer of the book of Hebrews on the first verse of this Psalm. He declares, "This man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till His enemies be made His footstool." Heb. 10:12, 13.

Then it is clear that this oath, made when Christ was bidden to sit at the right hand of God, must have been "after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever."

Reader, do you believe that Christ "offered one sacrifice for sins forever," *before He was ever made a*

priest? Do you believe that "By His own blood He entered in once into the holy place" (sanctuary) and "offered Himself without spot to God," *before He was ever made a priest?*

The very scripture which is quoted to prove that He did, plainly disproves it; for it says "after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God."

MEANING OF THE TERMS "OFFERING" AND "OFFERED"

Lest an attempt be made to dodge the force of this text by saying that the phrase "offered one sacrifice for sins forever," means only that He died on the cross, let the reader note carefully the argument of the apostle as follows:

But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood which he *offered* * * * for the sins of the people.

The reader will notice that the text does not confine the term "offering" to the slaying of the victim on the day of atonement, but includes the *offering* of the victim's blood in the second apartment of the sanctuary once every year. Note the following also:

But Christ being come an high priest * * * neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place [sanctuary] having obtained eternal redemption for us.

Note again that the thought is not limited to the *slaying* of goats and calves on the day of atonement, nor to the *death* of Christ on the cross; but includes the *entering in* once of Christ into the heavenly sanctuary by His own blood, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

Note this testimony also:

For the blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of an heifer *sprinkling* the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.

Notice again, he is not talking about the *slaying of the victim* only, but the *sprinkling of the blood*; nor about the *shedding* of Christ's blood *on the cross* only, but the *offering* of that blood *to God*, by faith in which, the conscience is purged.

Once again:

And every priest standeth daily *ministering* and *offering* oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God.

The contrast here is not alone between the death of the victims and the death of Christ, but between the "ministering"—the "offering"—of the shadowy priest and the "offering" of Christ, who "offered one sacrifice for sins forever," and then sat down on the right hand of God.

I owe the reader an apology for taking his time in answering this last objection; for though it seems impossible of belief, yet it is a fact that this desperate dodge is sometimes resorted to, to save the creed. In fact no devotee of infant damnation ever struggled harder to keep infants, "not a span long," in the flames of hell, than have the defenders of this error, struggled to keep Christ as High Priest, out of the holy of holies until 1844.

From the foregoing it is plain that the book of Hebrews is not devoted to a mere ceremony of dedication, nor is it devoted to the death of Christ on Calvary only; but to the glorious gospel truth of Christ's one offering, once offered for sins forever, "within the veil" "in the presence of God for us."

"WE HAVE BEEN SANCTIFIED," "SPRINKLED" AND
"PERFECTED"

In which were offered both gifts and sacrifices that could not make him that did the service *perfect* as pertaining to the conscience;

For the law * * * can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto *perfect*.

For by one offering He hath *perfected* forever them that are sanctified. Heb. 9:9; 10:1, 14.

The priests could never with their many offerings, make the comers *perfect*. But Christ, by His one offering, "hath *perfected forever* them that are sanctified."

For if the blood of bulls and goats * * * *sanctifieth* to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ * * * who offered Himself without spot to God, *purge* your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.

By which will we *have been sanctified* (R. V.) through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. * * * For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are *sanctified*.

Of how much sorer punishment, * * * shall he be thought worthy * * * who hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he *was sanctified* an unholy thing. Heb. 9:13; 10:10, 14, 29.

These scriptures plainly declare that the offering of the blood of Christ *has sanctified*. What the blood of bulls and goats could accomplish in the *sanctification* of the *flesh*, the blood of Christ has done as regards the *conscience*. It matters not that men have not yet learned of this great salvation, the fact still remains that He has done it and is waiting for men to believe it, accept it, and rejoice in it.

Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the *conscience*.

For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshipers once purged would have had no more *conscience* [consciousness R. V.] of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.

Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled [having been sprinkled as to our hearts, Rotherham] from an evil *conscience*. Heb. 9:9; 10:2-4, 22.

These scriptures tell us that what the yearly sacrifices could not do as pertaining to the conscience, the one sacrifice of Christ has accomplished. Every day

of atonement in the type brought the people face to face with the fact that although they were forgiven, their sins were not yet atoned for, and would not be until the great antitypical offering should be made by Christ, their great High Priest.

But why, some one will ask, does the denomination attempt to apply all the foregoing scriptures to a mere ceremonial dedication of the heavenly sanctuary? Or why is the denomination so desperately opposed to Christ's entering into the holy of holies, into the presence of the Father, as High Priest, *at His ascension*? What harm would it do?

The reason why all this scripture is perverted, is that if it be allowed to teach what it plainly does teach, it will show that the denomination has made a mistake. It has taught for over sixty years that Christ did not enter the holy of holies "for us" until 1844; and to admit now that He did, would be to admit that the denomination had made a mistake.

But the denomination has made other mistakes and lived; it has lived and prospered for sixty years while teaching that "within the veil" of Heb. 6:19, 20, referred to the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, a position which it now repudiates as a mistake.

Not only does the position of this book plainly contradict the teaching of the Scriptures, but it prohibits God from ministering mercy from His dwelling place, to sinning, suffering humanity for 4000 years. And why is this done? Simply because if God be allowed to minister mercy from His mercy-seat in heaven, prior to the cross, then that will constitute a ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. And this must not be allowed. For if it be allowed, then a ministry having been performed in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary before the cross, Christ could then perform the ministry in the holy of holies at His ascension. But this must not be allowed, because if he goes into the holy of holies at His ascension, and sprinkles His blood

upon the mercy-seat in behalf of sinners, how could it be said that He went in to do that work in 1844?

THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY CLOSED FOR 4000 YEARS

But who teaches that heaven was closed to the cries of sinners for four-thousand years? This denominational book teaches it, as the following will show:

Likewise before the heavenly sanctuary was opened for service, the new covenant was ratified by the blood of Christ, and the sanctuary, with all that pertains to its ministry, was solemnly dedicated to the sacred purpose to which they were henceforth to be devoted.

“By His own blood He entered in once into the holy place.”

A further study of the dedication of the earthly sanctuary will help us to understand when the new covenant sanctuary was dedicated and opened for service. *A More Excellent Ministry*, pp. 42, 43.

To what sanctuary and to what mercy-seat did men look in their sin and sorrow, and from what sanctuary and from what mercy-seat was ministered the mercy which men prayed for before the cross; if the heavenly sanctuary was not opened for service until Christ died? From the earthly sanctuary,—from the earthly mercy-seat, we are told.

But brethren, there was no earthly mercy-seat for twenty-five hundred years, that is, from creation to Moses. And from the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in 607 to its destruction by Titus in A. D. 70, over six-hundred years, the earthly sanctuary contained neither ark, law, mercy-seat, nor shekinah glory. For those six hundred years, the holy of holies contained only a stone.

During the time from Moses to the captivity, the ark was at one time in the hands of the Philistines, at another time in a private house, and at still another time was displaced by an idol by King Manasseh, and later restored by Josiah. 2 Chron. 33:4 and 35:3.

With these facts before us, let us take a candid look at this doctrine by means of an illustration, before we bring the authority of scripture to bear upon it. Let

us think of a ministering angel bearing the prayer of Abel to the heavenly sanctuary. But before presenting the illustration, I wish to quote a statement from the pamphlet upon which we are agreed. The quotation is from page eighteen and is quoted from page four-hundred twenty of Great Controversy. The quotation reads as follows :

By the offering of blood, the sinner acknowledged the authority of the law, confessed his guilt in transgression, and expressed his desire for pardon through faith in a Redeemer to come.

This is exactly what I believe and teach as regards the meaning of the individual offering. To show this, let a quotation from "Cast Out" be placed alongside of it.

The blood sprinkled before the veil, inasmuch as it was brought by the sinner, was nothing more than the sinner's confession of sin, and prayer for pardon through faith in the blood of Christ. "Cast Out for the Cross of Christ," page 41.

We are now agreed that the blood of the offering which the sinner brought under the old dispensation, represented his confession of sin, and expressed his desire for pardon through faith in a Redeemer to come.

Therefore when Abel offered his sin offering, he thereby confessed his sin, and prayed for pardon through faith in the blood of his Redeemer to come. And now let us return to our illustration. One of those angels who are ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation, with Abel's confession and prayer for pardon, appears at the heavenly sanctuary and asks permission to present Abel's confession and prayer at the throne of grace before the veil.

But, according to the illustration, an angel is on guard, holding the same views as Eld. Andross and the denomination, as expressed in this book, that the heavenly sanctuary is not yet "opened for service."

Ministering angel. May I pass in and present Abel's

confession and prayer for pardon to our merciful God enthroned above the mercy-seat?

Guardian Angel. No. The sanctuary is closed.

M. A. But is not our merciful God within, upon the mercy-seat?

G. A. Yes.

M. A. Is He not anxious that sinners confess their sins and pray to Him for pardon?

G. A. Yes.

M. A. Is He not willing to pardon?

G. A. Yes.

M. A. Then why can not I present Abel's prayer to Him?

G. A. Because as I told you, the sanctuary is closed.

M. A. Is it closed temporarily?

G. A. No. It never has been open and will not be open for four-thousand years.

M. A. But why is it closed?

G. A. Because the blood of Christ, the sinner's substitute has not yet been shed.

M. A. But cannot the Lord hear Abel's prayer for pardon through faith in the Redeemer to come, and can He not grant his petition by virtue of the Redeemer's blood to be shed?

G. A. No. No mercy can be ministered from this sanctuary for four-thousand years, I told you.

M. A. Where, then, can I present Abel's prayer for pardon?

G. A. I will tell you what you might do. I understand that a shadow or pattern of this sanctuary is to be built of boards and badgers' skins on the earth, some twenty-five hundred years later. You might wait and present Abel's petition there, then.

M. A. But Abel needs this pardon now. Must the poor man die in his sins without pardon? Why cannot God minister pardon *now* from this sanctuary by virtue of the blood of Christ *to be shed*? The reason

you give is certainly not sufficient. You must have some weightier reason. What is it?

G. A. Well, the fact is that some six-thousand years later, a small body of earnest people will teach that the Messiah entered within the veil in 1844 to make atonement for sin. And that will make it necessary to begin the work of ministering mercy from this sanctuary at the cross instead of creation. And so you can plainly see how letting you in here now will show them to be in error, and necessitate changes in their doctrine, and in their publications.

M. A. But what is the saving of a creed compared with the salvation of a world? I see every reason why our merciful God should minister mercy from His mercy-seat *now* to the sinners of earth, by virtue of the *coming death of His Son*.

G. A. There are a few among us who are willing for you to present Abel's prayer for pardon at the mercy-seat, and are willing that God should pardon Abel from His mercy-seat, on condition that you will not speak of it as a *ministry*. By this means they think we will be able to save the sinner and also the creed. But for my part, I am opposed to your presenting your petition here, and opposed to God's granting pardon from this place. I propose to take no chances by ministering mercy from this place at this time.

M. A. Then pray tell me, where shall I go for mercy, if not here? Here is the throne of grace, and here is our gracious God. Where else can I go?

G. A. I am sorry for you, and for Abel; but I confess I cannot tell you where to present your petition. I have stated the situation as it is, and can say no more.

“THE MOST HIGH DWELLETH NOT IN TEMPLES MADE WITH HANDS”

This unreasonable and unscriptural theory not only locks heaven for twenty-five hundred years, and leaves the world without even a *shadowy* mercy-seat; but

after the shadowy sanctuary is erected, it degrades the great and terrible God, the Creator and upholder of the universe, by making Him to dwell in a tent of boards and badger skins, among images and pictures of angels.

Reader, go out some starry night and behold the heavens, the work of His hands, the myriad hosts of suns and systems, and try to think of the Almighty transferring the throne of the universe to a temple made with hands.

But who teaches such an absurdity, the reader will ask? This denominational book now under review, teaches it.

In proving that God ministered mercy from the heavenly sanctuary before the cross, I quoted, among other scriptures, Isa. 6:1-7. In trying to prove that God *did not* minister mercy from the heavenly sanctuary for four-thousand years, the denomination in this new book, tries to show that this glorious, living throne, with its six-winged cherubim, crying, "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts;" is the throne and Lord of Hosts that dwelt above the mercy-seat in the *earthly* sanctuary.

When I wrote "Cast Out" and applied this scripture to the heavenly sanctuary, I was in harmony with the then published position of the denomination. For in "Bible Students' Library" No. 55, entitled "*The Order of Events in the Judgment*," by Eld. J. N. Andrews, on page 63, this scripture is quoted and applied to the heavenly sanctuary.

Now comes this new book teaching that Isaiah's vision and the vision of Ezekiel (chapters 1, 8, 9, 10, 11), are visions of the throne of God which dwelt in the *earthly* sanctuary; and the ministering angels who ministered coals of fire from the altar, were ministering from the *earthly* sanctuary, and from the altar connected with the *earthly sanctuary*. Here is the author's conclusion:

Both Ezekiel and Isaiah saw the Lord sitting on His throne, attended by a host of angels; both speak of the temple as the house; and both record the action of an angel who took burning coals from the sanctuary to purge iniquity; in one case for an individual, in the other for a city. *A More Excellent Ministry, page 136.*

We are agreed on the following points regarding these visions of Isaiah and Ezekiel:

First. Both visions describe a ministry by which iniquity is purged.

Second. This ministry is performed by ministering angels.

Third. The fire used by the ministering angels is taken from an altar.

Fourth. The throne, the angels, the altar, the fire, and the cleansing ministry are connected with the sanctuary.

Fifth. The throne, the angels, the altar, and the fire, are the same in both Isaiah's and Ezekiel's visions.

The denomination in this new book teaches that all belong to the *earthly sanctuary*. The Scriptures teach that all belong to the *heavenly sanctuary*.

That this throne was the real throne of God which dwells in the heavenly sanctuary, is proven by the fact that the same throne is seen in the heavenly sanctuary, by John with the seven lamps of fire burning before it.

The throne seen by John is the same throne as seen by Ezekiel and Isaiah; because both Ezekiel and John behold a rainbow above the throne. Both see four living creatures full of eyes. Both see living creatures with four faces, the faces of a man, an ox, a lion, and an eagle. These living creatures were connected with the throne.

Both Isaiah and John see six-winged cherubim, and hear the cry, "Holy, holy, holy" Lord God Almighty. Thus it is proven that the throne of Ezekiel's and Isaiah's visions is the throne which John saw in the true tabernacle in heaven, as recorded in Rev. 4:1-8.

And now since this throne is God's true throne, connected with His true sanctuary, and not the typical throne that was connected with the earthly sanctuary; and since the angels who ministered, ministered from this throne, and were connected with this true throne, which was connected with the true sanctuary; it follows that this ministry by which iniquity was purged, was a ministry connected with the *heavenly* sanctuary and *not* with the earthly.

But why should the S. D. A. denomination attempt to place this throne, whose wheels were "so high that they were dreadful"—its throne of indescribable glory, its "wheel within a wheel," its flaming six-winged cherubim, its firmament of "terrible crystal," its rainbow-circled Jehovah,—why should the denomination attempt to locate all this in the narrow confines of a temple made with hands, 15 feet wide by 45 feet long by 15 feet high!!

For the simple reason that if it be admitted that from this throne pardon was ministered, and this throne be shown to be the throne connected with the heavenly sanctuary,—if it be admitted that a mite of mercy was ever ministered from the throne of God connected with the heavenly sanctuary, at any time from creation to the cross, then the denomination's position that the heavenly sanctuary was closed for four-thousand years, is an error. And if it be admitted that there was a ministry from the heavenly sanctuary before the cross, then the way is open for Christ to enter the holy of holies at His ascension and offer one sacrifice for sins forever, and sit down on the right hand of God.

Reader, can you not see why such a fight is made to keep God from ministering any mercy from heaven for four-thousand years? If it be permitted, then—then what? Then mortal man has made a mistake!

In the quotation above cited the statement is made by the denomination that the coals of fire taken from the altar by the ministering angels, were taken from

the *earthly* sanctuary. But this is not true, as we shall see.

In the first place, ministering angels are not the ministers connected with the earthly sanctuary, they are not of the tribe of Levi. On the other hand, the altar from which the coals of fire were ministered was connected with the terrible throne, and was not the altar in the earthly sanctuary. And besides, this throne was not seen in the earthly sanctuary.

The throne seen by Ezekiel came from heaven. "The heavens were opened and I saw visions of God."

And I looked, and, behold, a whirlwind came out of the north, a great cloud, and a fire infolding itself, and a brightness was about it, and out of the midst thereof as the color of amber, out of the midst of the fire. Also out of the midst thereof came the likeness of four living creatures. Eze. 1:1-5.

As the vision drew nearer he discerned a firmament (ver. 22), then a throne, and then upon the throne the likeness of a man, the likeness of the glory of the Lord. (ver. 26-28). Later, this same glory of the Lord was seen in Jerusalem. (Eze. 8:1-4) standing "on the right side of the house"; not *in* the house. Chap. 10:4.

Now the cherubim stood on the right side of the house, when the man went in [between the wheels]; and the cloud filled the inner court. Then the glory of the Lord went up from the cherubim [which stood on the right side of the house] and stood over the threshold of the house; and the house was filled with the cloud, and the court was full of the brightness of the Lord's glory. Chap. 10:3, 4.

Then the glory of the Lord departed from off the threshold of the house, and "*stood over the cherubim,*" [which stood on the right side of the house.]

And the cherubim lifted up their wings and mounted up from the earth in my sight: * * * and stood at the door of the east gate of the Lord's house; and the glory of the God of Israel was over them above. Vs. 18, 19.

Then did the cherubim lift up their wings, and the wheels beside them; and the glory of the God of Israel was over them above. And the glory of the Lord went up from the midst of the city, and stood upon the mountain which is on the east side of the city. Chap. 11:22, 23.

Then Ezekiel was returned to Chaldea to them of the captivity and "the vision went up from me." Ver. 24.

The above is a description of the movements of God and His throne as seen in Ezekiel's vision, from the time they entered Jerusalem to their return to heaven, and at no time do they enter the earthly sanctuary. The cherubim approach no nearer than the "right side of the house," and "the glory of the Lord," no nearer than the "threshold of the house." However, from the cherubim at the right side of the house, and from the glory of the Lord above the threshold of the house, "The court was full of the brightness of the Lord's glory," and the house was "filled with the cloud."

Nor did the angels minister the coals of fire from the sanctuary which at this time was wholly given up to heathen idolatry. (Chap. 8:5-18). The coals of fire were ministered from between the cherubim which were at the right side of the house; not from the polluted sanctuary.

The above scriptures prove conclusively that this terrible throne of Jehovah never entered the defiled sanctuary at Jerusalem. The court and house were filled—the first, with the brightness of the Lord's glory; and the second, with the cloud, from the throne and from the Lord's glory, both outside the house.

These scriptures also prove that the fire ministered by the angel did not come from the desecrated Jewish altar, but from the altar which was "under the cherub," "between the cherubim," "between the wheels." The altar was connected with the terrible throne which returned to heaven, and not with the earthly sanctuary whose altar was devoted to the worship of idols.

And now let us turn to Isaiah's vision of the same terrible God on the same awful throne.

In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, *high and lifted up*, and His train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphims: each one had

six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory. And the posts of the door moved at the voice of him that cried, and the house was filled with smoke. Isa. 6:1-4.

This is the same glorious throne, the same Jehovah that was seen by John in the heavenly sanctuary. And it is the same throne and the same Lord of glory that were seen by Ezekiel at the right side of the house, and above the threshold of the house, whose brightness filled the court, and whose cloud filled the house.

But just as Ezekiel did not see this dreadful throne with its terrible wheels, its cherubim, firmament, throne and flaming Jehovah in the temple *made with hands*, so Isaiah did not see this throne in that temple. He saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, which he could not have seen if they had been in the holy of holies, unless the veil of the second apartment were opened. And it does not say that the Lord was sitting upon a throne *in* the temple, but only that His "*train*" filled the temple.

The word here translated "train," margin "skirts," occurs eleven times in the Old Testament. Six times it is translated "hem" or "hems," four times "skirt" or "skirts," and once "train" as in our text.

Thus it is made clear that as in Ezekiel's vision, so here, Jehovah's awful throne was not in the earthly sanctuary, but only the "hem" or the "skirts" of His glory filled the temple.

And just as in Ezekiel's vision, the altar from which an angel ministered coals of fire, was connected with the throne, "between the wheels," so the coals of fire which the angel ministered to the lips of Isaiah, must have been from the altar connected with this terrible throne.

Therefore, we conclude that the ministry which Ezekiel and Isaiah saw, was from God's real throne

which is associated with His real sanctuary, and not from the typical throne in the earthly sanctuary.

And this is the time and place to acknowledge a mistake. I believed with Eld. J. N. Andrews, as recorded in his work, "*The Order of Events in the Judgment*," that the temple of Isaiah's vision was the heavenly sanctuary. For I knew that the throne was the true throne and not the shadow. And supposing that it was *in* the sanctuary, I naturally concluded it must be the heavenly sanctuary. But after a more careful investigation, I found that the throne was not *in* the temple, but only the "train," "hem," or "skirt," of God's glory filled the temple. I am glad to correct this mistake, for I have exchanged an error for truth, and I will not pretend that I have always believed what is here written, as the denomination has done regarding the phrase "within the veil" in its new book. I am not infallible and I know it. I can, therefore, acknowledge a mistake without hurting my reputation.

"HEAVEN IS MY THRONE"

The denomination's attempt to make Isaiah's and Ezekiel's glorious throne to be the throne that dwelt in the earthly sanctuary, reveals an error which the Jews, in their pride and blindness held. The Jews came to believe that God, the creator and upholder of the universe, actually dwelt in their sanctuary which they had built. Notwithstanding it was plainly declared to be a "pattern," it soon came to be regarded as the actual dwelling-place of God, and the ministry of its priests, and the blood of its victims as actually taking away sin.

When Solomon wrote to Hiram for material to build the temple, fearing that Hiram would get the impression that Solomon's God could dwell in the narrow confines of a temple made with hands, he wrote to Hiram as follows:

But who is able to build Him an house, seeing the heaven

and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Him? Who am I then, that I should build Him an house, save only to burn sacrifice before him. (2 Chron. 2:6.)

At the dedication of the temple, Solomon offered a prayer, indicted of the Lord, which contained nine distinct statements that God's dwelling-place was then in heaven. The Lord knew that Satan would use this temple to hide His true dwelling-place, rather than to point men to it, and so he inspired Solomon to pray thus:

But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded? I Kings 8:27.

When they shall pray toward this place * * * Here thou *in heaven thy dwelling place*, and when Thou hearest, forgive. (Ver. 30.)

Then hear thou *in heaven*. (Ver. 32.)

Then hear Thou *in heaven* and forgive the sins of thy people Israel. (Ver. 24.)

Then hear Thou *in heaven* and forgive the sins of thy servants. (Ver. 36.)

Then hear Thou *in heaven Thy dwelling-place* and forgive. (Ver. 39.)

Hear Thou *in heaven Thy dwelling-place* and do according to all that the stranger calleth to Thee for. (Ver. 43.)

Then hear their prayer and their supplication *in heaven Thy dwelling place* and maintain their cause, and forgive thy people that have sinned against Thee, and all their transgressions wherein they have transgressed against Thee. (Vs. 49, 50.)

This same prayer is recorded in 2 Chron. 6. In the seventh chapter and fourteenth verse we have recorded the response of the Lord to Solomon's oft repeated prayer that the Lord would hear in heaven, His dwelling-place, the prayer of His children, and forgive their sins. Here is His response:

"Then will I hear *from heaven* and will forgive their sins."

Reader, do I hear you say, "Why waste time proving so evident a truth as that God's dwelling-place was always in heaven, and that all forgiveness came from there?"

I have felt the force of this criticism and have felt like apologizing to the reader for spending so much time in proving that which ought to have needed no proof. But when a denomination makes war on this plain truth, and publishes a book denying that God ever pardoned sin from His true dwelling-place in heaven, during a period of four thousand years; and when thousands of God's children who pride themselves that they have the "truth," accept this error, it becomes necessary to multiply evidence against the error and in favor of the truth. If this were only the opinion of the author of the book under review, it would be ignored in silence. When you read the following, remember it is not the opinion of one man, but is announced as "the sanctuary question as understood by the denomination." (See advertisement of the pamphlet in "*Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly*," First Quarter, 1913, page 40.

Thus we see that, enshrouded in the cloudy pillar, *the Lord of glory* descended to earth and at the door of the tabernacle, *in the tabernacle* of the congregation, as well as *in the holy of holies*, He met with the anointed priest. A. M. E. M., pp. 137, 138.

Instead of the pillar of cloud in the earthly sanctuary being *a symbol* of the Lord of glory in His true tabernacle in heaven, we are here told that *Jehovah Himself* descended to earth and met with the priest *in* the earthly sanctuary. This same view was held by the Jews in the days of Isaiah, and the Lord tried to correct it by sending this message to them through Isaiah:

Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is My throne, and the earth is My footstool; where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of My rest? For all these things have Mine hands made, and all these things have been, saith the Lord. Isa. 66:1-2.

All these efforts of the Lord to get Israel to see His true sanctuary in heaven, failed. The earthly sanctuary became more and more a stumbling-block. The sanctuary, like the brazen serpent, became an object of worship, and, like it, had to be destroyed. "And they

burned the house of God," is the brief record of the destruction of that which was ordained to help men see the true sanctuary, but which was used by them to hide it. When, after the captivity, another was built, it contained no ark, no mercy-seat, no cherubim of glory, and no pillar of cloud. But in the place of these only a stone. And thus it was through all the centuries down to the destruction of the temple by Titus. Only a boulder in the holy of holies! and yet the Jews clung to the creed that it was the real dwelling-place of God. And Seventh-day Adventists cling to that same creed today, and teach that this glory-deserted sanctuary was the only sanctuary in the universe open to the cry of sinners; and its stone-furnished holy of holies was the only place from which pardon was ministered to sinful men!

This was the creed when Christ came to the temple. And with all His teaching of heavenly things, the Jews still clung to their idea that their temple was the only dwelling-place of God, and the only place from which pardon was ministered. Peter, on the day of Pentecost, pointed them upward to the true, and a few, by faith, beheld Christ at the right hand of God.

A last effort is made by the martyr Stephen to get them to look beyond the typical to the true. His teaching that God did not dwell in their temple, and never had dwelt there, and that it was only a fashion of the true dwelling-place of God, was counted "blasphemous words against this holy place"; and so they caught him and brought him before the council. "Then said the high priest, are these things so?"

And there before the maddened mob, with the knowledge that to tell the truth about the earthly sanctuary would mean death, he stood and cried, with the courage of a Christian:

The Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; as saith the prophet, Heaven is my throne, and earth is my footstool: what house will ye build me? said the Lord; or

what is the place of My rest? Hath not My hand made all these things? Acts 7:48-50.

This closed the martyr's discourse on the sanctuary, and that same statement is liable to close a discourse on the sanctuary in the councils of the S. D. A. church today. Just as that statement was heresy then, so is it heresy today. And just as the Jews stoned Stephen out of their midst and out of the world, so are the Seventh-day Adventists today casting out men and women who believe and teach this same truth.

After the martyr had looked up into heaven and beheld God, dwelling where he had always dwelt, in the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary, and where Stephen had just declared Him to be and supported his declaration by the testimony of Isaiah, he closed his testimony with these witnessing words: "Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God." "And they stoned Stephen calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Acts 7:56, 59.

Hear the conclusion of the whole matter. The Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; and He *never has dwelt* in temples made with hands. His throne is, and *always has been*, in heaven. He never dwelt in the earthly, save by a *symbol* of His glory. "Heaven is My throne." And from that throne He has ministered pardon to perishing men. "Hear thou in heaven Thy dwelling-place, and when Thou hearest, forgive." May the Lord raise up more men who are willing today to repeat Solomon's and Isaiah's and Stephen's testimony to this truth, though they be stoned out of the camp.

DOES THE SPIRIT TEACH THAT HEAVEN WAS CLOSED FOR FORTY CENTURIES?

The Holy Spirit has borne witness to the fact that the service in the heavenly sanctuary did not begin while the first tabernacle remained standing; or, as rendered by Roth-erham, "has a standing" * * * Till the veil of the tem-

ple was rent at the crucifixion of Christ, the way of approach to the true sanctuary could not be disclosed. Ibid. pp. 106, 107.

This is an awful charge to bring against the Holy Spirit. This statement taken with the one on page forty-two, that the heavenly sanctuary was not "opened for service" before the cross, makes the Holy Spirit say that God's only real dwelling-place was closed to the cries of sinners until the crucifixion; and that no mercy was ministered from God's only real dwelling-place for four thousand years. We have already proven the charge to be untrue, but let us examine it further.

For the first twenty-five hundred years, there was no typical sanctuary. But there was the *true sanctuary*, with its true mercy-seat and with the sinner's merciful God enthroned above it. Now when Abel or Abraham cried to God for pardon, where did they direct their prayers? This denominational book says that the heavenly sanctuary was closed to their cries; and the Scriptures declare that the earthly sanctuary was not yet built. From what mercy-seat, then, I ask, was the mercy ministered for which the Patriarchs prayed? After the earthly was built, was the heavenly still closed? Did God take up His abode in the temple made with hands? Never! "The Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands, as saith the prophet, Heaven is my throne." Was the way of approach to the Most High's only dwelling place closed, and the door of the shadow opened? Does the Holy Spirit teach this? Does the Holy Spirit teach that from Moses to Christ, men prayed only to the shadow of God? Does it teach that the way to the only true God was closed?

When King Manasseh defiled the sanctuary and displaced the ark with an idol, does the Holy Spirit teach that the way to the true God was closed, and the only way that was open to the sinner was the way to that defiled shadow, that heathen idol? Does the Holy Spirit teach that the only place from which mercy and

grace could come was from the place of that idol enthroned within the veil?

When at last the defiled shadow of God's real dwelling-place was burned, and there remained only ashes of that defiled shadow, was access to God's real and only dwelling-place closed? And was there no way open to a sinning world but the way to the ashes of that defiled shadow? Does the Holy Spirit teach this? Where did men look for help? To what sanctuary did men direct their prayers from the burning of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar to the restoration of it by Nehemiah? No shadowy temple, no shadowy victim, no shadowy ministry! Did the salvation of sinners cease for more than a hundred years? Were there no ministering angels sent forth to minister to them that were heirs of salvation? If there were, from what sanctuary did they come with their blessings of pardon and life?

When the sanctuary was rebuilt and its holy of holies held only a stone,—no ark, no mercy-seat, no cherubim, and no symbol of God's glory — from what sanctuary did men receive pardon? Was the way to the true and living God barricaded and barred, and did the blessings of pardon and peace come only from the bosom of a boulder? Does the Holy Spirit bear witness to such teaching as this? No, never! "The Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands." "Heaven is My throne." "Hear thou in heaven Thy dwelling place, and when thou hearest, forgive."

The author professes to find a foundation for this awful charge against the Holy Spirit in Heb. 9:8, which he quotes on page 105. The text in the common version reads thus:

WHAT DOES THE SPIRIT TEACH?

The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all [sanctuary] was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing.

This the author interprets to mean that the way into the heavenly sanctuary was not open while the earthly sanctuary was yet standing. But of course it does not say this and it does not mean this. The temple stood until destroyed by Titus in A. D. 70, many years after Christ had entered the heavenly sanctuary. This cold fact has compelled the author to accept the true and accurate translation of the original Greek, and opens the way for a correct understanding of the scripture. Below are a number of translations of the phrase under consideration:

The first tabernacle having yet a standing. (Young's Literal Translation.)

Still the first tabernacle having a standing. (Interlinear Translation.)

While as yet the first tabernacle has (its) standing. (Dr. Darby's Translation.)

So long as the first tent has a standing. (Rotherham's Translation.)

While the first tabernacle yet has a standing. (Sawyer's Translation.)

Thus it is seen that this phrase does not refer to the earthly sanctuary as standing in the sense of being erected. And now in order to ascertain what this phrase does mean, let us examine the term "first tabernacle." The author, of course, applies this term to the earthly sanctuary, and thereby makes the Holy Spirit say, that so long as the earthly tabernacle had a standing, the heavenly sanctuary was closed to sinners.

But this term "first tabernacle" does not refer to the earthly sanctuary, for the good and sufficient reason that the earthly sanctuary was not the "first tabernacle." The true tabernacle was the first, and the shadow was patterned after it. The term appears three times in Heb. 9, as follows:

For there was a tabernacle made; the *first*, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread.

All must admit that the "first" here refers to the first apartment. Now notice the next use of the term.

Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the *first tabernacle* accomplishing the service of God. But into *the second* went the high priest alone once every year.

Again we are compelled, in this case as in the one before, to conclude that the term "the first tabernacle" refers to the first apartment, and the term "the second" (tabernacle) refers to the second apartment. Now this being true, how dare anyone give the same expression an altogether different meaning in the next verse, as follows:

The Holy Ghost this signifying that the way into (Lit. Greek, the way of) the holies [sanctuary] was not yet made manifest while the first tabernacle was yet standing [has a standing.]

The original Greek for "first tabernacle" in this verse is identical with the Greek of verse six, and must refer to the same "first apartment." The Variorum Reference Bible has a foot-note referring to the term "first tabernacle" in verses 2, 6 and 8, which reads as follows: "Vs. 2, 6, 8, foremost, outer." Then follows six authorities in support of this rendering led by Dean Alford.

Therefore the terms "first tabernacle" and "second" (tabernacle) refer to the first and second *apartments* of *the sanctuary*, and *not* to the earthly and heavenly *sanctuaries*.

Rotherham translates the next as follows:

Now these things having been thus prepared, into the first tent indeed continually do the priests enter, the Divine services completing, but into the second, once for all in the year, only the high priest, not without blood which he offereth for himself and the ignorances of the people: the Holy Spirit making this evident that not yet hath been manifest the way through the holy place [sanctuary] so long as the first tent hath a standing.

There is no Greek word in the text for "into," as anyone can learn by examining the Interlinear Translation where the English word is placed directly under the Greek word. Of course the text could not say that the way "into" the sanctuary was not yet open,

when it had just said that the priests went always into the first apartment of the sanctuary. The literal rendering as given in several translations which I have, reads "the way *of*" the sanctuary is not yet made manifest while the "first tabernacle" has a standing. That is, while the priests were going in and out of the first apartment, the way of the sanctuary, that is, the way through (Rotherham) into the second apartment, is not yet made manifest.

From all this, we are bound to conclude that this scripture is not presenting a contrast between the earthly sanctuary and the heavenly sanctuary, but a contrast between the first apartment and the second apartment. Therefore this scripture cannot be used to teach that the heavenly sanctuary was closed to the cries of sinners for four thousand years; and that the only place from which pardon was ministered was the earthly sanctuary. The charge that the Holy Spirit bore testimony to this terrible doctrine is shown to be a false charge. The truth taught in this will be considered later.

Now what is the application of this teaching that, so long as the first apartment services have a standing, the way of the sanctuary is not yet made manifest? The apostle next applies this truth to the work of Christ in the greater and more perfect tabernacle thus:

"Which is a figure (Greek, parable) for the time then present."

The Revised Version reads "the time now present," and the American Standard changes it to "time present." There is neither "then" nor "now" in the Greek, but only "the time present." But it is easy to determine what time is referred to, for it is the time in which gifts and sacrifices are offered that could not perfect the worshipers, which were "imposed on them until the time of reformation." It is "for the time" "until the time" when "Christ being come an High Priest of the good things to come." It is "for the

time" "until the time" Christ being come High Priest "by His own blood entered in once into the holy place [sanctuary] having obtained eternal redemption for us."

Therefore the "time present" is the time while the offerings were being offered which could not take away sin, and which continued until Christ, as High Priest, comes, and by His own blood, enters in once into the sanctuary as the antitype of the going in once every year of the high priest in the type.

While the priests were going in and out of the first apartment,—while the first apartment "has a standing," the once a year going in to the second apartment by the high priest, is delayed, "is not yet made manifest."

In like manner, the entering in "once" of Christ into the greater tabernacle, is not made manifest while the first apartment of that tabernacle has a standing.

The honest unbiased reader will see that this scripture, instead of making the Holy Spirit bear testimony to the awful doctrine that God's real dwelling-place in heaven was closed to the cries of sinners for four thousand years, and that no mercy could be ministered from there, teaches instead, that the way of the true sanctuary was not made manifest while the first apartment services of that sanctuary has a standing.

LOOKING TO INSTEAD OF THROUGH

Before quoting one of the most astounding statements of this astonishing book, let me ask the reader a few simple questions.

Was the brazen serpent, lifted up in the wilderness for the bitten to look *to*, or to look *through*? Did the Lord want the dying to believe that their healing came from the serpent of brass? As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up. Was not the serpent lifted up in the wilder-

ness that men might look *through* that serpent to the great crucified One, through whom comes all healing for soul and body? But Israel, after a time, began to look *to* the serpent instead of *through* it, and it was finally destroyed.

He [Hezekiah] * * * brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made, for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it. And he called it Nehushtan [that is, "a piece of brass."] 2 Kings 18:4.

That which was only a piece of brass made to look *through* to see the great Healer, became something to burn incense to; became a god.

Was baptism something to look *to* or *through*? Was it not instituted that the sinner might look *through* it and see Christ's death, burial, and resurrection *for him*? When the sinner goes down into the watery grave, is he not, *through* that act, expressing his faith in Christ's death, burial, and resurrection for him? But great masses of men today have come to look *to* baptism for their cleansing, instead of *through* it to the cross.

Was the Lord's supper instituted to look *through* or *to*? "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come." 1 Cor. 11:26. But the same great masses of men have come to look *to* these emblems instead of *through* them. The bread is now declared to be God and not a symbol. Men carry the bread as God through the streets, fall down and worship it as it passes, and burn incense to it in magnificent temples. They burn incense to a piece of bread, as God, like the blind Israelites burned incense to a piece of brass, as God. They look *to* it instead of *through* it.

And now for the application of all this. Was the earthly sanctuary built to look *through* or to look *to*? For twenty-five hundred years without it men had looked *through* to God in heaven for cleansing and power. Abraham needed no sanctuary to look *through*

that he might see God. Abraham was far-sighted. But near-sighted idolatrous Israel had lived in Egypt so long that they had lost the *through-look*, and had, like their Egyptian neighbors, come to look *to* earthly things as God. "These be thy gods, O Israel which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt," was the announcement at the dedication of the golden calf. Ex. 32:8.

Did God build the earthly sanctuary which was only a shadow of His real dwelling-place, for the purpose of turning men's eyes *away from Him* and *His sanctuary* to His shadow and to His shadowy dwelling-place on earth?

In dealing with blind men, God is in a straight betwixt two. He knows that if He gives them no material channel to look through, they will not see Him at all. But if He gives them a symbol to help them see Him, He knows that many will worship the symbol. God knew when He built the shadow that some men would look only *to* it. But he knew also that some would look *through* it and *see the true*. To guard against their looking *to* the sanctuary, the Lord made it very plain to Moses that the sanctuary was but a "pattern" of God's real dwelling-place. And when the beautiful temple of Solomon was built, because of its grandeur, there was greater danger of men's looking *to* it instead of *through* it. Consequently the Lord took great precautions to prevent this error. Although the Lord, by the symbol of His presence, had, a moment before, filled the house "so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud: for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of the Lord"; (1 Kings 8:10, 11) notwithstanding this, the Lord inspired Solomon to kneel upon his knees "before the altar of the Lord, in the presence of all the congregation of Israel, and spread forth his hands toward heaven" and offer a prayer to God IN HEAVEN.

In this prayer he first announced before all that host

that he understood that the heaven of the heavens could not contain God, much less the house he had built. And with his hands still stretched forth *toward heaven*, he continued to pray to God *in heaven*; and not once nor twice, but eight times in his short prayer he asked God *in heaven* to hear the prayer of His people and pardon their iniquities. His praying to God *in heaven* is the more remarkable just at this time, because the glory of God had filled the tabernacle, and driven the priests from the altar. If ever there was a time when it would seem proper to pray to the tabernacle, it was then. But looking past the shadowy sanctuary and its shadowy glory, *to* the true God in His true sanctuary, he presents his petition *to* the true God *in* His true dwelling-place; leaving an example for all temple-worshippers, to look *through* that sanctuary to heaven for pardon and power, and not *to* the earthly.

And it was so, that when Solomon had made an end of praying all this prayer and supplication unto the Lord, he arose from before the altar of the Lord, from kneeling on his knees with his hands spread up to *heaven*. 1 Kings 8:54.

And after beholding the king with his hands "spread up to heaven" beyond the temple's shadowy glory; after listening to this prayer offered to God in heaven, that God would hear in heaven, how could any Israelite, how could any Seventh-day Adventist, come to believe that heaven was closed to the cries of sinners for four thousand years, and that pardon and peace were ministered only from the *shadow* of God and His dwelling-place?

It is true the Israelites were asked to pray toward Jerusalem and toward the temple even when the temple was in ashes, but *not* that God was dwelling in the temple, nor in its ashes; but they were commanded thus to pray that they might keep in mind the true God, whose shadowy dwelling-place he had established at Jerusalem.

As before stated, this prayer of Solomon is recorded

twice in the Old Testament, and the response of God to the prayer is recorded once. "Then will I hear from heaven and will forgive their sins and heal their land." 2 Chron. 7:14.

Besides all this, the prayer that every Israelite was taught to pray when he offered his first-fruits, was a constant reminder that God's dwelling-place was in heaven; and that it was there he should present his petition, and that from there he was to expect his blessings. "Look down from Thy holy habitation, *from heaven*, and bless Thy people Israel." Deut. 26:15.

This prayer, like the prayer of Solomon, was offered in the immediate presence of the earthly sanctuary, with its shadowy glory. And yet it was directed to God's holy habitation in *heaven*, and it asked and expected blessings *from heaven*. Reader, in the face of all this, was there ever any excuse for any Israelite, or any Seventh-day Adventist, ever coming to believe that the earthly sanctuary was God's real dwelling-place, and that men should look there for pardon and blessing? Was there ever any reason for any Israelite looking to that sanctuary, or any excuse for any Seventh-day Adventist thinking that the Israelite should look *to* that sanctuary instead of *through* it to the true?

And yet in the face of all these precautions it was not long before men began to look *to* the earthly sanctuary instead of *through* it. It was not long before men came to worship God *in* the temple instead of God *through* the temple. Then, to save them from this ruin, the Lord sent a message through the prophet Isaiah, saying:

The Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands. The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool. Where is the house that YE will build ME? All these things have MINE hands made. Isa. 66:1, 2.

Notwithstanding this solemn warning, the eyes of

God's back-sliding people were more and more turned toward the *shadow* of the dwelling-place. Finally, in order to save them, he was compelled to destroy the shadow. It was looking *to* the temple instead of *through* it that brought its ruin.

After the temple was rebuilt, God did not supply its holy of holies with ark or mercy-seat or cherubim or shekinah glory. Only an unchiseled stone marked the spot where the symbol of God's throne once stood.

But the second temple had not equaled the first in magnificence; nor was it hallowed by those visible tokens of the divine presence which pertained to the first temple. There was no manifestation of supernatural power to mark its dedication. No cloud of glory was seen to fill the newly erected sanctuary. No fire from heaven descended to consume the sacrifice upon its altar. The shekinah no longer abode between the cherubim in the most holy place; the ark, the mercy-seat, and the tables of the testimony were not to be found therein. No voice sounded from heaven to make known to the enquiring priest the will of Jehovah. (*Gt. Con., Chap. 1.*)

From these facts it is evident that from the restoration of the temple by Nehemiah, to its destruction by Titus, not even the shadow of God and His throne, were to be found in the earthly sanctuary. And why was this new pattern deprived of its shadowy throne? Evidently that there might be less excuse for God's people turning their eyes away from His dwelling-place in heaven to its shadow in Jerusalem. Nevertheless with its glory gone, the devil succeeded in turning the eyes of the people away from the true to the shadow, so that when Christ came, men, as never before, were looking *to* the shadow to see God, instead of looking *through* it, to see Him.

When Christ appeared in the flesh, He tried to point them heavenward, but they refused to look. Peter on the day of Pentecost, tried to get them to see God in heaven with Christ on His right hand, but only a few would look. Stephen cried with his dying breath, "The Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands ;

heaven is my throne, the earth is my footstool." But they stoned him to death.

And now, reader, listen to this quoted from this new denominational book:

The Holy Spirit has borne witness to the fact that the service in the heavenly sanctuary did not begin while the first tabernacle remained standing. * * * Till the veil of the temple was rent in twain at the crucifixion of Christ, the way of approach to the true sanctuary could not be disclosed. *A. M. E. M. page 106, 107.*

This statement justifies the blind Jews in looking to the shadow instead of through it. If the way to the heavenly sanctuary could not be disclosed, and was not disclosed, it was useless to pray to God in heaven, for there was no ministry there, and the Jew was therefore compelled to pray *to* the earthly sanctuary instead of through it. But that the way to God was not closed is proven by Solomon's prayer, offered to God *in heaven*, heard *in heaven*, and answered *from heaven*.

Notice this, which follows the former quotation:

From the time of the dedication of the earthly sanctuary at Mt. Sinai, till Jesus died on Calvary, the eyes of God's people were turned toward His holy habitation [Jerusalem]. * * * No longer are the eyes of God's people turned toward old Jerusalem with its magnificent temple and gorgeously robed priests. Through the suffering and death of the Son of God, a new and living way into the celestial sanctuary is consecrated for us. *Id., p. 107.*

The former quotation informs us that the way of approach to God in His true sanctuary was not disclosed until Christ was crucified. Consequently the eyes of the Israelites "were turned" toward Jerusalem. And now we are told in this second quotation, that the eyes of God's people were to be turned toward God's celestial sanctuary. If the eyes of God's people were turned toward old Jerusalem instead of toward heaven, who turned them there? Solomon's eyes were not turned toward the shadow, his eyes were turned toward God in heaven. The eyes of the Israelite who offered his first fruits were turned toward heaven. If men's eyes were turned toward the shadow instead of to-

ward heaven, who turned them there? The work of turning men's eyes away from God in heaven to the earthly sanctuary was always the work of the father of lies. But in this new denominational book, we are given to understand that it was God who turned the eyes of His people away from Himself in heaven, to His shadow on earth.

LOST BY LOOKING TO

This looking *to* the shadow instead of through *it* to the true, brought ruin to Israel. It led to the rejection of Christ. Had they been looking through the shadow to the real—had they been offering their prayers to God in the true sanctuary, and been receiving pardon and spiritual life from heaven through the merits of the Lamb of God to come, they would have been waiting for the true sacrifice to appear, and shed His blood and offer it as true High Priest within the veil of the true sanctuary for their sins. But inasmuch as they looked to the earthly (as the author says); inasmuch as they looked upon the shadowy sanctuary as the true sanctuary; they naturally looked upon the shadowy victim as the true victim, and the shadowy blood as the real blood that took away sin, and their high priest as the true High Priest. It only followed as a natural consequence that they should reject Christ, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.

And had God not destroyed the earthly temple as Hezekiah destroyed the brazen serpent, and scattered the saints to the four winds of heaven, the Christian church at Jerusalem would have been ruined. Many of its members continued to look to the earthly sanctuary, and to persecute men like Paul who looked higher; and to save them, God destroyed the shadow.

And this closing of the heavenly sanctuary for four thousand years, and this looking to the earthly for salvation, as taught in this new book, has had the effect

to hide the blessed gospel of salvation by grace from the eyes of Seventh-day Adventists. Since it teaches that the heavenly sanctuary was closed until the cross, all the real, true work of salvation pictured in the sanctuary, must be crowded forward into the time after the cross. To do this, it must be denied that Christ entered within the veil and sprinkled His blood upon the mercy-seat to satisfy the demands of the law "for us." It must be maintained that He only went in to perform a "ceremony" by which God and His throne was "dedicated to the sacred purpose to which they were *henceforth* to be devoted." It must be denied that they were devoted to the work of saving sinners for the first four thousand years. And since the Scriptures declare that Christ sat down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, the throne of Majesty must be moved into the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, to prevent Christ's remaining in the holy of holies. Because this entering into the holy of holies "for us" must be reserved for use in 1844.

This necessitates the locating of God and our great High Priest in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, with a veil between them and the true mercy-seat, for eighteen centuries. It makes it necessary to deny that Christ sprinkled His blood upon the mercy-seat to satisfy the demands of the law for the sinner's life until 1844. And inasmuch as Christ was counted the sinner, it places Him on the throne with the Father "above every name that is named," while the law, *still unsatisfied*, continues to demand His blood. It puts off the atonement until after men's probation is closed, and delays the sprinkling of the blood of Christ on the mercy-seat to satisfy the demands of the law, until after man's probation is closed. It makes the atonement for sin and sinners depend upon what *man* had done for God instead of what God has done for man; thus making the atonement de-

pend on man's works instead of God's works, thereby frustrating the grace of God, and making the promise of none effect. What God promised to do, and swore that He would do, for all nations, is made to depend upon what man has done.

Inasmuch as it locates the Father and the Son in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary for eighteen centuries, it becomes necessary to make the type bear testimony to this same thing. To do this, the Scriptures must be wrested and their evident meaning perverted. This desperate attempt to locate the shadowy glory of Jehovah in the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary in the immediate presence of the ministering priest, will be next examined.

THERE WILL I MEET WITH THEE

Before noticing the scriptures which are used to support this strange position, let us examine those scriptures which plainly locate the shadowy glory in the holy of holies above the mercy-seat.

And thou shalt put the mercy-seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I will give thee.

And there will I meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel. Ex. 25:21, 22.

This scripture plainly declares that God would meet with Moses and commune with him from the mercy-seat concerning all things which He would give Moses in commandment unto the children of Israel. In harmony with this promise to speak from the mercy-seat, we have the following record:

And when Moses was gone into the tabernacle of the congregation to speak with Him, then he heard the voice of one speaking unto him from off the mercy-seat that was upon the ark of the testimony, from between the two cherubim and He spake unto him. Num. 7:89.

Aaron, the high priest, was warned of God not to

enter "within the veil," except on one certain day in the year, and with a particular sacrifice, lest he die. And the reason given is, "For I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat." Young's Literal Translation reads, "For in a cloud am I seen upon the mercy-seat." Lev. 16:2.

This apartment was always recognized as the dwelling-place of the symbol of God's presence as further appears from the following scriptures:

So the people sent to Shiloh, that they might bring from thence the ark of the covenant of the Lord of Hosts, which dwelleth between the cherubims. 1 Sam. 4:4.

And David arose and went * * * to bring up from thence the ark of God, whose name is called by the name of the Lord of Hosts that dwelleth between the cherubims. 2 Sam. 6:2.

And Hezekiah prayed unto the Lord, saying, O Lord of Hosts, God of Israel, that dwellest between the cherubims, Thou art the God, even Thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth; Thou hast made heaven and earth. Isa. 37:15, 16.

Give ear, O shepherd of Israel, Thou that leadest Joseph like a flock; Thou that dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth. Ps. 80:1.

The Lord reigneth; let the people tremble: He sitteth between the cherubims; let the earth be moved. Ps. 99:1.

That some of these scriptures refer to the heavenly sanctuary, only strengthens our position that between the cherubim above the ark and in the holy of holies is God's dwelling-place.

The holy of holies in Solomon's temple, is repeatedly called "the oracle," "the place of speaking," for this is the place from which God spake to His people through Moses and the high priest. In harmony with this are the following quotations:

In the sanctuary and the temple, that were the earthly symbols of God's dwelling-place, one apartment was sacred to His presence. The veil inwrought with cherubim at its entrance was not to be lifted by any hand save one. To lift that veil, and intrude unbidden into the sacred mystery of the most holy place was death. For above the mercy-seat and the bowed, worshiping angels, dwelt the glory of the Holiest,—glory upon which no man might look and live.

On the one day of the year appointed for ministry in the most holy place, the high priest with trembling entered God's presence, while clouds of incense veiled the glory from his sight.—*Testimonies for the Church Vol. 8, page 284.*

And beyond the second veil was the holy shekinah, the visible manifestation of God's glory, before which none but the high priest could enter and live. The matchless splendor of the earthly tabernacle reflected to human vision the glories of that temple where Christ our forerunner ministers for us before the throne of God. *Gt. Con. page 414.*

Above the mercy-seat was the shekinah, the manifestation of the divine presence; and from between the cherubim, God made known His will. * * * Above the law was the mercy-seat, upon which the presence of God was revealed, and from which, by virtue of the atonement, pardon was granted to the repentant sinner. * * * Beyond the second veil the sacred ark, with its mystic cherubim, and above it the holy shekinah, the visible manifestation of Jehovah's presence; all but a dim reflection of the glories of the temple of God in heaven, the great center of the work for man's redemption. *Patriarchs and Prophets page 349.*

In the awful mystery of the holy of holies His glory dwelt. *Desire of Ages*, subscription edition, page 212.

Only once a year could the high priest enter into the most holy place, after the most careful and solemn preparation. No mortal eye but that of the high priest could look upon the sacred grandeur of that apartment, because it was the especial dwelling-place of God's visible glory. *Spirit of Prophecy Vol. 1, page 274.*

This ark was considered the glory and strength of Israel. The token of the divine presence abode upon it day and night. *Spirit of Prophecy Vol. 1, page 398.*

Neither the Bible, nor the writings of Mrs. E. G. White, know anything about this new theory of God's visible glory dwelling in the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary while the priest ministered in the immediate presence of that glory. If no one but the high priest could enter into the presence of that glory on but one day of the year and live, how could the common priests minister in the immediate presence of that glory for three hundred and sixty-four days in the year and live? In the face of this overwhelming testimony that God dwelt in the holy of holies between the cherubim, do you believe that God would tell us

that he came out of the holy of holies and dwelt in the first apartment in the immediate presence of the priests; or that He came to the door of the tabernacle every time an Israelite offered a burnt offering, or every morning and evening when the continual burnt offering was offered? If God left the mercy-seat and dwelt in the first apartment in the presence of the priests, what was the earthly use of the veil? And was not the holy of holies which God had left, a safer place for the priests than the first apartment, into which we are told God had entered? Or if God left the holy of holies and came out to the door of the tabernacle into the immediate presence of the sinner, every time a man of all the millions of Israel offered a burnt offering, would not the Lord have to abide at the door of the tabernacle most of the time? And would not the holy of holies, abandoned by God's glory, be a safer place for the sinner than the altar of burnt offering?

Would you think that God would make the mercy-seat and place it within the veil for his especial dwelling-place, and warn his priests not to enter into His presence under penalty of death, and then immediately abandon His dwelling-place and take up His abode in the first apartment, or at the door of the tabernacle, and dwell there on every day of the year except the one day of atonement?

And right here I would like to ask, What heavenly use there ever was for the veil in the heavenly sanctuary? We can clearly see the use that it had in the earthly. It separated the consuming glory of God from the ministering priests until the blood was shed that paid the price of sin. But if God and the Son abandon the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary and take up their abode in the first apartment, of what use is the veil?

Returning to the subject under immediate consideration: Reader, if you should find one or two scriptures in the Old Testament that seemed to teach that God

did dwell in the first apartment, or at the door of the tabernacle, and which would therefore contradict the unanimous testimony above quoted, would you not think it wise to carefully and prayerfully study those one or two scriptures to see if you could not see harmony between them and the others? Then let us do this.

The scriptures relied upon to prove this strange position are Ex. 30:36; Lev. 1:1; and Ex. 29:42, 43.

“THE TENT OF MEETING”

These are the scriptures quoted in this new book, to prove that God dwelt in the first apartment and at the door of the tabernacle. The key to the harmony between these scriptures and those which say that God dwelt within the veil, is to be found in the correct understanding of the term “the tabernacle of the congregation.” It is generally supposed by Seventh-day Adventists that this term applies only to the first apartment of the tabernacle. But in our study we find that it generally applies to the whole sanctuary, and should be rendered “tent of meeting” as in the Revised Version, The American Standard, and Young’s Literal Translation. The word “congregation” in the phrase “tabernacle of the congregation” as translated in the authorized version, is from a different word in the Hebrew than the word “congregation” meaning the assembled people. The two words appear together in the following text, which is quoted from the American Standard: “And the whole congregation of the children of Israel assembled together at Shiloh, and set up the *“tent of meeting.”*”

“Tent of meeting,” therefore, does not mean a place in which the people assembled, but a place where the sinner came to meet the Lord. The tent of meeting took its name from the fact that it was a place where men went to meet God and worship Him as He appeared in the symbol of His glory. Before the regular tent of meeting was built, “Moses used to take the tent

and pitch it without the camp, afar off from the camp; and he called it the tent of meeting. And it came to pass, that everyone who sought the Lord went out unto the tent of meeting, which was without the camp." Ex. 33:7. R. V.

It was called the tent of meeting because men went out to it, to *meet* the Lord, because the symbol of the Lord's presence was there.

When the regular tent of meeting was built, it, too, was called the tent of meeting, because men came to meet God there. The following scriptures prove that the term "tent of meeting," is applied to the whole sanctuary. It is true that in a few instances where a distinction must be made, the first apartment is called the tent of meeting and the second "the holy place" as in Lev. 16. The whole sanctuary was called the tent of meeting, and the part separated by the veil, is called the "holy place." In the New Testament we have the whole called "the holies" or "sanctuary"; and that part in the "holies," "within the veil," is called the "holies of holies," or it might be translated, sanctuary of the sanctuary. The following scriptures prove that the term "tent of meeting," or as in our version, "tabernacle of the congregation," is applied to the whole sanctuary. The scriptures are quoted from the Revised Version and are the same in the American Standard.

So Solomon and all the assembly with him went to the high place that was at Gibeon; for there was the tent of meeting of God, which Moses the servant of Jehovah had made in the wilderness. 2 Chron. 1:3.

And they brought up the ark, and the tent of meeting, and all the holy vessels that were in the tent. (2 Chron. 5:5.)

And the whole congregation of the children of Israel assembled themselves together at Shiloh, and set up the tent of meeting there. Josh. 18:1. See also Ex. 31:6-8. Ex. 35:21. Ex. 39:32. Ex. 40:1-3. Num. 2:2. Num. 2:17. Num. 3:25, 38. Num. 4:4-15, 21-28, 29-31, 42-48.

These scriptures prove that the term "tent of meet-

ing" was the name of the whole tabernacle. And now applying this truth to the scriptures under consideration, we find that when Jehovah called unto Moses out of the tent of meeting, it did not mean that God was dwelling in the first apartment in the presence of the priests, but merely that He was in the tabernacle, which is here called "the tent of meeting." Following the scripture in Lev. 1:1, there are recorded the commandments which God gave unto the children of Israel through Moses, and which largely compose the book of Leviticus. And it is only fair to say that God spake the Levitical law from the place in the tent of meeting, or sanctuary which He told Moses He would speak from as recorded in Ex. 25:22. "And there I will meet thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, of *all things* which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel."

Here is a scripture which the brethren have not used in this discussion:

And when Moses went into the tent of meeting to speak with him then he heard the voice speaking unto him from above the mercy-seat that was upon the ark of the testimony, from between the two cherubim: and he spake unto him. Num. 7:89 R. V.

The reason why this scripture was not used was because it showed plainly that God was not in the first apartment when he spake with Moses, but in that part of the "tent of meeting" that contained the ark and cherubim, the place from which He told Moses He would speak when He commanded him to make the ark. By this it is seen that when Moses went into the tent of meeting to speak with the Lord, the Lord did not leave the mercy-seat and come out into the first apartment, but spake to him from the mercy-seat as He promised to do.

The next text that is used to get the Lord away from the mercy-seat into the first apartment so as to fur-

nish a precedent for His leaving the ark and mercy-seat in the heavenly sanctuary, is Ex. 30:36, before quoted. Neither does this scripture say that the Lord dwelt in the first apartment of the sanctuary.

The term tabernacle of the congregation, or "tent of meeting," as in the Revised Version, means the whole sanctuary here as it does in the seventh verse of the next chapter. With this fact before us, this text is in harmony with the rest of the scripture. The sixth verse of the same chapter has been overlooked by the author. It reads: "And thou shalt put it [the altar of incense] before the veil that is by the ark of the testimony before the mercy-seat that is over the testimony, *where I will meet with thee.*"

This states the same truth as Ex. 25:22. Notice the similarity. "And there will I meet with thee and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark."

The text which is used to prove that the Lord left the mercy-seat and stood at the door of the tabernacle every time a man offered a burnt offering, and while the morning and evening burnt offerings were offered, is Ex. 29:41, 42, before quoted.

That the "tent of meeting" in this text is again the whole sanctuary is proved by the very next verse, "And I will sanctify the tent of meeting and the altar." And with this understanding of the scripture, it is in harmony with the other scriptures which declare God's dwelling-place to be the holy of holies. In Ex. 25:21, 22, the Lord told Moses He would meet him at the mercy-seat; but the Lord did not leave the mercy-seat to meet Moses, nor did Moses go within the veil to meet the Lord, but as in Num. 7:89, when Moses went into the sanctuary, the Lord spake to him from within the veil as He promised He would. So when the Lord promises to meet the children of Israel at the door of the tabernacle, it did not mean that the Lord would leave the mercy-seat and come out in His consuming

glory and stand in the direct presence of the sinner, but merely that that was the place where the sinner was to come to meet God who was, as in the case of Moses, dwelling in the holy of holies.

The children of Israel were forbidden to offer their offerings, anywhere but at the door of the tent of meeting. They must bring their offerings to the tent of meeting, for there *in* the tent of meeting the Lord would meet with them. The Septuagint's rendering of this verse bears out this position. It reads:

A perpetual sacrifice throughout your generations at the door of the tabernacle of witness, before the Lord WHERE-IN I will be known to thee from thence so as to speak to thee.

The Septuagint translates Ex. 30:6 in the same way:

And thou shalt set it before the veil that is over the ark of the testimony *wherein* [within the veil] I will make myself known to thee from thence.

That this is in harmony with the Hebrew, an examination of the original will prove. And thus perfect harmony is seen between these scriptures and those that plainly declare God's typical dwelling-place to be above the mercy-seat within the veil.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE REVELATION

Let us now examine all those scriptures that are quoted from the book of Revelation to prove that God and His Son abandoned the mercy-seat and moved out into the first apartment for eighteen centuries. Here is one:

And immediately I was in the spirit: and, behold, a throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne. Rev. 4:2.

But where, you ask, is the proof in this scripture that the testimony of the Old Testament is untrue? The short phrase, "a throne was set in heaven," we are informed, proves that God's throne was moved from the holy of holies and set in the first apartment.

Reader, call to mind again all the scriptures before quoted which placed the glory of God above the mercy-seat in the second apartment of the shadow. Remem-

ber also the testimony of Mrs. White to the same fact, and then turn and read those six words again. "A throne was set in heaven."

We are asked to believe that these six words teach that God's throne was moved into the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary and abode there from the cross to 1844. But is it not asking a great deal of these six words to ask them to teach all this, especially since such teaching contradicts testimony of the Old Testament? Of the six words, the two little words "was set" are called upon to furnish the burden of proof. "Was set" we are told, teaches that the throne was set somewhere. Well, suppose it does. It does not tell us where it was set. If it said a throne was set in the first apartment, then there would be some evidence for the contention. But it does not, neither does it say that a throne was set "where it had not been before," as the author says. The author quotes several scriptures to support the idea that the term teaches that something was placed "where it had not been before." But the very first scripture quoted, contradicts the idea. "A city that is set upon a hill cannot be hid."

Where had the city been set before it was set on a hill? Rome is a city that was set on seven hills. Where was Rome set before it was set on seven hills? In this instance it plainly means, established on a hill or situated on a hill.

Another instance of the use of the word is found in Rev. 21:16. "And the city lieth four square." If the word had been translated the same as Rev. 4:2, it would have read: "And the city is set four square." But when was the city set four square, and was it ever set somewhere else in some other form before it was set four square? But suppose Rev. 4:2 did teach that the throne was just then set somewhere where it had not been sitting, before it was sitting there. That would not prove that the throne of God had been moved from the holy of holies into the first apartment. The

author is a strong advocate of the mobility of the throne until he gets it out of the holy of holies into the first apartment, and then it is so permanent that it remains here for more than eighteen centuries. But now since the throne is living and movable, could it not have just returned to its dwelling-place in the holy of holies, following its mission to some other place, as in the case of Ezekiel's vision where it is represented as visiting the earth and then returning to heaven?

But the simple truth is that, like a city set on a hill, the prophet saw a throne set in heaven, or situated in heaven. Dr. Darby's translation reads thus: "And behold a throne stood in heaven;" that is, was located, or situated in heaven.

Dr. Albert Barnes translates the scripture thus: "And behold, a throne was there in heaven." This understanding of the text leaves the book of Revelation in harmony with the Old Testament, but furnishes no evidence upon which to found the theory that the throne of God had been moved away from the mercy-seat into the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, where it should remain for eighteen centuries.

An effort is made to connect this scripture with Dan. 7:9, 10, where the Revised Version reads, "I beheld till thrones were placed." Upon this point the author has this comment:

In both Daniel 7 and Rev. 4 there is brought to our notice the placing of a throne in heaven upon which sat the great Jehovah. A. M. E. M. page 140.

The reader will notice that the author says "a throne," but Daniel says "thrones" were placed. In presenting the same publicly, in my hearing, the author argued that the "thrones" of Dan. 7 referred to the two thrones of the Father and Son, and that the scripture taught that these two thrones were moved in 1844 from the first apartment into the second apartment of the sanctuary. But every student knows that Christ is seated on His Father's throne until after His

enemies are made His foot-stool. "Him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in My throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with My Father in His throne." Rev. 3:21. And thus will a false theory lead a man to pervert the plainest scripture in his endeavor to sustain it. The theory demands that God's throne be moved from the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary into the second; but Daniel 7:9, does not say that God's throne was moved, but it does say that "thrones" were placed, which the author attempts to make apply to God's throne. But inasmuch as the text says that "thrones," (plural) were placed, in order to make this apply to God's throne, it becomes necessary to say that it refers to the Father's throne and the Son's throne. But as before stated, every "student" knows that Christ is not seated upon His own throne until the end of the world, but is seated on His Father's throne.

The thrones that were placed were, no doubt, the thrones of the twenty-four elders who were seen seated on seats (Greek, thrones) in John's vision. (Rev. 11:16). This is the view taught by the denomination in Eld. Smith's "Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation."

Thus vanishes all hope of making this text support the theory that God's throne was moved into the first apartment at His ascension and there remained until 1844, and then was moved back to its foundation, the law of God.

THE TWENTY-FOUR ELDERS

Again, the twenty-four elders, as seen in Rev. 4:4, are used to prove that the throne of God dwelt in the first apartment, because twenty-four elders are seen with Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, and because the plural number of priests ministered in the first apartment in the type and only one, the high priest, in the second. This argument would have some force if the twenty-four elders were seen only in the first apart-

ment of the heavenly sanctuary, but in Rev. 11:16, the elders are seen before God on their thrones after the seventh trumpet has sounded, which the author teaches began to sound in 1844. Therefore the elders are seen in the holy of holies after 1844. Hence the presence of twenty-four elders proves nothing with reference to the location of the throne of God. Commenting on this scripture, the denomination, through the work "Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation," says:

The particular attention of the reader is asked to the fact that the four and twenty elders are said to be seated on thrones. Our translation, it is true, reads "seats"; but the Greek is * * * "thrones" and so the Revised Version reads: "And round about the throne were four and twenty thrones, and upon the thrones I saw four and twenty elders sitting." This passage, consequently, throws light on the expression found in Dan. 7:9: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down." These are the same thrones. * * * These four and twenty elders (see Chap. 5) are supposed to be assistants of Christ in His mediatorial work in the sanctuary on high; and when the judgment scene of Dan. 7:9 commenced in the most holy place, their seats, or thrones, would be set, or placed, there, according to the testimony of that passage.

Here we have the testimony of the denomination that these twenty-four elders are seen in the holy of holies. But it might be urged, How could the twenty-four elders be associated with Christ in the holy of holies, since the high priest alone made the atonement there, and the other priests were not even allowed in the first apartment at that time?

The objection would have weight against my position, if I taught that Christ was engaged in making the atonement in the holy of holies *from His ascension to 1844*. But *this is not my teaching*. Reader, how long do you suppose it took the high priest to sprinkle the blood of the Lord's goat seven times with his fingers upon the mercy-seat? And how long do you think it would take Christ to sprinkle His blood upon the mercy-seat at His ascension? That He performed this work on a single day is evident from the record in

John 20:17-19. Christ refused to permit Mary to touch Him until He had ascended to His Father. Later, on the same day, He appeared to His disciples after His ascension to His Father.

On this ascension to the Father, the denomination publishes this comment:

Jesus refused to receive the homage of His people until He knew that His sacrifice had been accepted by the Father, and until He had received the assurance from God Himself that His atonement for the sins of His people had been full and ample, that through His blood they might gain eternal life. Jesus immediately ascended to heaven and presented Himself before the throne of God, [which all admit was at this time in the holy of holies], showing the marks of shame and cruelty upon His brow, His hands and feet. But He refused to receive the coronet of glory and the royal robe, and He also refused the adoration of the angels, as He had refused the homage of Mary, until the Father signified that His offering was accepted. * * * All power in heaven and on earth is now given to the Prince of Life yet He does not for a moment forget His poor disciples in a sinful world, but prepares to return to them, that He may impart to them His power and glory. Thus did the Redeemer of mankind, by the sacrifice of Himself, connect earth with heaven, and finite man with the infinite God. *Spirit of Prophecy Vol. 3, pp. 202, 203.*

This offering of His sacrifice at the throne of God, and its acceptance by the Father on the day of His resurrection, constitutes the antitype of the high priest entering in alone into the holy of holies and sprinkling the blood upon the mercy-seat. And when the Father, upon His throne, in the holy of holies, on this resurrection day, announced to Christ our great High Priest "that His atonement for the sins of His people had been full and ample," that constitutes the one offering, once offered by which the sins of men were atoned for, so that thereafter "there is no more offering for sin." And after this resurrection day, after this presentation of the blood of Christ at the heavenly mercy-seat, and after the acceptance of that sacrifice on behalf of sin, and after the announcement is made that Christ's atonement has been full and ample, it matters not to

me if twenty-four, or twenty-four thousand elders are seen around the throne of God. Their presence cannot nullify the fact that the great antitypical atonement at the mercy-seat has been made and accepted.

But this is not all that the high priest did on the day of atonement in the holy of holies. There is still the antitypical atonement to be made upon the head of the antitypical scape-goat. But when Christ has made the atonement at the mercy-seat, He is told to sit down on the right hand of the Father, and wait for the finishing of the work until His enemies be made His foot-stool. The original Greek bears out this thought. The term "from henceforth" in Heb. 10:13, in the original is an adjective and a noun, literally rendered would be "the rest." Rotherham's translation renders the text thus, "But this priest having offered one sacrifice for sins evermore, sat down on the right hand of God: *as for the rest* waiting until His foes be made His foot-stool." Young's Literal Translation renders it: "*As to the rest* expecting till He may place his enemies as His foot-stool."

From this it is seen that the Scriptures put a waiting time between the offering of one sacrifice for sins forever at the mercy-seat, and the rest of the work which is the placing of sins upon the head of the antitypical scape-goat. The denomination places the waiting time between the shedding of the blood of Christ and its sprinkling upon the mercy-seat to make atonement for sin. But the book of Hebrews has no waiting time here, but, as before stated, places the waiting time between the atonement at the mercy-seat and the atonement upon the head of Satan.

The author on page 193 of his book, characterizes the statement, that there were two atonements made on the day of atonement, (the first on the mercy-seat, and the other on the head of the scape-goat), as wholly unsupported by Scripture."

But what saith the Scriptures? After the high priest

had made atonement with the blood of the Lord's goat at the mercy-seat, he laid his hands on the head of the scape-goat and confessed over him the iniquities of the children of Israel, "putting them upon the head of the goat." Lev. 16:21. This act is called in verse ten, making "an atonement with him." (Over him, Revised Version margin.) Thus it is seen that the statement is *wholly supported* by Scripture.

THE SEVEN GOLDEN CANDLESTICKS

Another scripture used to prove that Christ and the Father dwelt in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary till 1844, is Rev. 1:12, 13. Because Christ is here seen walking among the seven golden candlesticks, it is asserted that He is ministering in the first apartment. We will let Eld. Uriah Smith answer this argument.

Seven golden candlesticks. These cannot be the antitype of the golden candlestick of the ancient typical temple service; for that was but *one* candlestick with seven branches. That is ever spoken of in the singular number. But here are *seven*; and these are more properly lampstands than simply candlesticks, stands upon which lamps are set to give light in the room, and they bear no resemblance to the ancient candlestick. On the contrary, the stands are so distinct, and so far separated from each other that the Son of man is seen walking about in the midst of them. [See comments on Rev. 1:13].

It may be added that the seven golden candlesticks (Greek lamp-stands, Revised Version, margin), are interpreted to be "the seven churches." Now all know that the seven churches are on the earth, not in heaven. And there is no evidence that this is a scene in heaven; no mention has yet been made of heaven. Not until we reach the fourth chapter does John "behold a door opened in heaven," and hear a voice saying "come up higher." It is in heaven that he sees the seven lamps of fire burning before the throne which he tells us are the seven spirits of God. Therefore the seven golden candlesticks which represent the seven

churches whose location is upon the earth, cannot be the antitype of the seven lamps of fire which are seen burning before the throne in heaven and which are interpreted to mean the seven spirits of God.

Here, then, is not a particle of proof that at the ascension of Christ, God and His Son abandoned the mercy-seat in the throne room of the heavenly sanctuary, moved out into the first apartment, there to abide for eighteen centuries in flagrant contradiction of the whole testimony of the Old Testament.

THE HIGH PRIEST'S ATONEMENT DAY DRESS

Pardon is asked of the reader for referring to the following:

The fact that the Son of man was wearing a golden girdle would indicate that He was officiating in the first apartment of the sanctuary as when the high priest officiated in the second apartment, he wore a linen girdle. A. M. E. M. page 168.

As I write this I have before me the denomination's book on the sanctuary, by Eld. Uriah Smith, entitled, "Looking Unto Jesus." On the first cover page of this book we have a picture of Christ with the words, "Our Great High Priest." He is here pictured in the dress of the high priest when he entered within the veil on the day of atonement, and He is seen "clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt . . . with a golden girdle." Thus the denomination, for at least fourteen years, has represented the atonement-day dress of our Great High Priest, as pictured in Rev. 1:13, with the one mistake that the girdle should have been "girt about the paps" instead of about the loins as in the picture.

Because Christ is seen girded with a golden girdle instead of a linen girdle, we are told it cannot be the dress of the day of atonement. But this would make trouble if applied to the common priests. For in Ex. 28:40 and 38:28, we are told that the common priests wore bonnets of fine linen. But in Rev. 4:4 the twenty-

four elders are wearing "crowns of gold." The author's reference to Rev. 1:13 is unfortunate; for, as the result of a study of the garment there described, I am convinced that it is a description of the atonement-day dress of our great High Priest as presented in the picture before mentioned. The garment worn by the high priest on the day of atonement in the type, was the plain white garment worn by the common priests. This is shown from Lev. 16:4, where the linen garments of the common priests are described as the garments with which the high priest was to enter the holy of holies. On other days the high priest wore other garments over these garments. He wore the robe of the ephod, also the ephod, which was a short coat, and in the breast of the ephod he wore the breastplate. But on the day of atonement he left off these garments, and appeared in the plain white of the common priests. This same truth is told in the following quotation:

As the high priest laid aside his gorgeous, pontifical robes, and officiated in the white linen dress of the common priest, so Christ took the form of a servant and offered sacrifice, Himself the priest, Himself the victim. Desire of Ages, Chap 1, Par. 17.

Josephus, in his "Antiquities of the Jews," Book 3, chap. 7, paragraphs 1 and 2, has this description of this garment worn by both the common priest and the high priest.

Over this [the linen breeches] he wore a linen vestment. * * * This vestment reaches down to the feet, and * * * is girded to the *breast* a little above the elbows, by a girdle often going round, * * * the beginning of its circumvolution is at the *breast*; and when it has gone often round, it is there tied, and hangs loosely there down to the ankles.

It will be noticed that this is the description of the garment in Rev. 1:13, both as to its reaching down to the feet and its being girded about the breast instead of the loins. In Rev. 15:6, we have the angels who minister from the sanctuary, clothed with this same dress and girded in the same way:

And the seven angels came out of the temple having the seven plagues, clothed in pure and white linen and having their breasts girded with golden girdles.

Therefore we must conclude that our Lord as pictured in Rev. 1:13, is clothed with the garments of the common priest which were the garments worn by the high priest on the day of atonement when he entered within the veil. Thus vanishes another effort to prove that the book of Revelation supports the theory that God's throne is located in the first apartment for eighteen centuries.

THE ARK AND THE SEVENTH TRUMPET

The vision of the ark of the testament as recorded in Rev. 11:19, is also used to support this erroneous theory. Because the ark is seen, and because the ark abode in the holy of holies, the conclusion is drawn that now the throne is moved into the second apartment, and that the ministry is now begun in that apartment. Yes, the view of the ark does prove that John saw the second apartment, because the ark abode in the second apartment. In like manner, when we see the throne in that same sanctuary located beyond the golden candlestick, as in Rev. 4:4; when "seven lamps of fire" are seen burning "before the throne," we conclude that the throne is located just where the type says that it was located, in the second apartment, where the seven lamps could be burning "*before the throne.*"

Again, when we see the throne beyond the altar of incense as in Rev. 8:3, we conclude that the throne is located above the ark just where the Bible testifies that it was located, where the altar could be *before* the throne.

Because it is said the ark is seen after the seventh trumpet sounds, it is argued, that at the sounding of the seventh trumpet, God and His Son moved back into the holy of holies to begin the work of atonement,—to begin sprinkling the blood upon the mercy-seat to satis-

fy the demands of the law for the life of the sinner, to finish the mystery of God. But here is where a fatal mistake has been made. The mystery of God is not finished while the seventh trumpet is sounding, but before it sounds.

I am glad that in this I am not alone. "Heretics" love company. The editor of the "Signs of the Times" published through that paper last summer, conclusive evidence that the seventh trumpet has not yet sounded.

While in England, I asked one, now high in the ranks of the educational work of the denomination, how he proved that the seventh trumpet has sounded. "I don't prove it. It hasn't sounded," was the reply. When asked how he had reached that conclusion, he answered: "By a study of the other trumpets. In the case of each of the other trumpets, when they sounded, it was the signal for a great military conflict. But there was no great war in 1844." I then explained how I had reached the same conclusion but by different means.

The Revised Version of Rev. 10:7, reads as follows:

While the authorized version says, "begin to sound," the Revised version, the American Standard, and ten others which I have, twelve in all, read, "about to sound." The Greek word is the same as found in the fourth verse where it is translated, "I was about to write." This Greek word occurs 112 times in the New Testament, and never is it translated "begin" except in this one instance, and never does it have the meaning of begin, but always the idea of about.

And this proves that the mystery of God is finished *before* the seventh trumpet sounds and not *after* it has begun to sound. When the sixth trumpet had sounded, the days belonged to the seventh trumpet; but the seventh trumpet does not sound immediately after the sixth trumpet sounds. "But in the days of the voice of the seventh trumpet [in the days that belong to his voice] when he is *about* to sound, then, is finished

the mystery of God." Thus it is seen that the seventh trumpet does not sound until the mystery of God is finished. Therefore, the seventh trumpet has not sounded.

As an additional proof that the seventh trumpet has not sounded, read what is said when it does sound:

And the seventh angel sounded; and there followed great voices in heaven, and they said, The kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ: and he shall reign forever and ever. And the four and twenty elders which sit before God on their thrones fell upon their faces and worshiped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God, the Almighty, which art, and which wast; BECAUSE THOU HAST TAKEN THY GREAT POWER, AND DIDST REIGN. And the nations were wroth, and thy wrath came, and the time of the dead to be judged, and the time to give their reward to Thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear Thy name, the small and the great; and to destroy them that destroy the earth. Rev. 11:15-18 R. V.

THE DENOMINATION'S DILEMMA

And now with this truth before us, the reader will see what a dilemma the denomination, and the author under review, are in. They do not have the holy of holies open, and the work of atonement for sin at the mercy-seat begin, until the seventh trumpet sounds. But the seventh trumpet does not sound until the mystery of God is finished. At the sounding of the seventh trumpet, God takes the kingdom and reigns. And thus the atonement for sin, the sprinkling of the blood of Christ above the mercy-seat is not commenced till after God takes the kingdom.

And now that this, another argument for the theory that God's throne was moved into the first apartment at Christ's ascension and eighteen centuries later moved back again to its place above the ark, has vanished, so far as this scripture is concerned; let us now see what the vision of the ark does teach.

It will be noticed that the prophet saw nothing but

the "ark of the testament." He saw no high priest sprinkling his blood on the mercy-seat. He saw no ministering angels, and no thrones placed, and no Jehovah sitting in judgment.

The good brethren who made the creed, saw all these things, but John saw only the ark of His testament. Or if he saw more, the Lord did not want him to record it. If the Lord had wanted us to see a judgment scene He would have pictured a judgment scene, for He is able to do this without man's having to imagine it. See Dan. 7:9, 10; Rev. 20:11, 12.

Thus it is seen that when God wants men to see a judgment scene, He pictures a judgment scene. Likewise, when God wants men to see the ark, He shows them the ark. And why did the Lord want men to see the ark? Because there is to be a great and final struggle between the powers of earth on the one hand, and the saints of God on the other, over the commandments of God that are contained in that ark.

And this is the time and place to say that the vision of the ark belongs to the line of prophecy that follows it, and not to the line that precedes it.

Each of the three great lines of prophecy, the seven seals, the seven trumpets, and the ten-horned and two-horned beasts, brings us to the coming of Christ. In the seven trumpets, that point is reached before the ark is shown. Therefore the vision of the ark belongs to the vision of the persecuting beasts.

Each of these three lines begins with a scene in heaven followed by a scene in the earth. I will quote a part of each scene as evidence of this. In the scene in heaven which is a preface to the seven seals, we read:

And out of the throne proceeded lightnings, and thunders, and voices. Rev. 4:5.

In the scene introducing the seven trumpets, it is recorded:

And the angel took the censer, and filled it with fire of

the altar and cast it into the earth: and there were voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, and an earthquake. Rev. 8:5.

In the scene introducing the persecution of the saints for keeping the commandments of God and having the testimony of Jesus Christ, we read:

And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in His temple the ark of His testament: and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail. Rev. 11:19.

Then follows the scene on the earth where the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet persecute the saints because they keep the commandments of God which are in the ark. Thus it is seen that this view of the ark perfectly fits the line of prophecy which *follows* it, but does not fit the line of prophecy which *precedes* it.

O how much this view of the ark means to those who refuse to honor the false sabbath and are loyal to the true. "How do you know that the commandments of God are the ten commandments?" asks the prosecutor. "There are many commandments of God. The New Testament is full of God's commandments. Why should you stand out against the whole Christian world, and against all of God's ordained powers and disobey the powers that be, and refuse to obey the laws enforcing Sunday sacredness? How do you know that the commandments of God in Rev. 12:17 and 14:12 are the ten commandments?"

"We know they are the ten commandments because the Lord in His introduction to the vision of this persecution gave us a view of the ark of His testament in heaven in which is His testimony, the ten commandments; a copy of which was placed in the ark of the testimony which Moses built as a type of the true. The fourth commandment of those ten commandments reads, 'The seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord.' Therefore your law enforcing the observance of the first day is contrary to God's holy law enshrined within

the ark of the testament beneath His throne in heaven; and we cannot disobey it.”

ANGELS AS PRIESTS

And now a few words concerning angels acting as priests in connection with the heavenly sanctuary.

In the second paragraph of the quotation which the author makes from “Patriarchs and Prophets,” which appears on page 13 of his book, there is an indication that something is omitted. In speaking of the cherubim that were wrought in the curtains of the sanctuary, the omitted lines say: They were “to represent the angelic host who are connected with the work of the heavenly sanctuary and who are ministering spirits to the people of God on earth.” “Patriarchs and Prophets,” page 347.

Then the angels are connected with the work of the heavenly sanctuary, and that work is to minister to the people of God on earth. The author has something to say on this same subject as follows:

They [the angels] could serve in the capacity of ministering spirits; they could offer the prayers of God’s people before the throne, and could communicate His will to man; but they could not act in the capacity of priests. *A. M. E. M.*, page 75.

This quotation admits that angels are ministering spirits, and that they can offer the prayers of God’s people before the throne, but does not dare admit that they minister pardon from that throne, lest some mercy escape from the throne of God in heaven, before the cross, and thereby a ministry be established from the true sanctuary, and the creed be found faulty.

But the first quotation says that the angels are connected with the work of the heavenly sanctuary, and that they are ministering spirits to the people of God on earth. So between the two quotations, we have the angels “connected with the work of the heavenly sanctuary,” “in the capacity of ministering spirits,” who “offer the prayers of God’s people before the throne”

and "who are ministering spirits to the people of God on earth."

When angels "offer the prayers of God's people before the throne" and then minister to the people of God on earth, what do they minister? Since they offer the prayers of God's people before the throne, and then minister to God's people on earth, what do they minister, if not the answer to the prayers for pardon which they offer, that is, pardon?

But the author exclaims in the preceding sentence, "applying these principles [that angels do not have a human personality] how, we ask, could they act as priests in the heavenly sanctuary?" Just this way, brother:

And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand. Rev. 8:3, 4.

This is the way angels can act as priests. He who offers the prayers of saints with incense at the golden altar before the throne, is a priest and is acting as a priest; and no amount of human reasoning can change the fact that angels do act as priests in connection with the heavenly sanctuary, and have acted as priests ever since man needed a priest.

And thus does another barrier erected at the door of the heavenly sanctuary to prevent God from ministering mercy from His true dwelling-place for four thousand years, crumble before a "thus saith the Lord."

It is true that only one with a "human personality" could, as high priest, present His blood at the mercy-seat and purchase the pardon which is ministered to men. Angels could not, therefore, act as high priests, but they can act, and have acted, and do act as priests in connection with the heavenly sanctuary, as these facts plainly prove.

Angel priests can pass the pardon on to penitent men, but they cannot purchase the pardon. So in the shadow, common priests could, in type, pass on to the penitent, the pardon prayed for, but only the high priest could in type, purchase that pardon with the blood of the Lord's goat, a substitute for his own, on the day of atonement. And so only our great High Priest, with His human personality, can once suffer, once enter, and once offer one sacrifice for sins forever and thereby purchase the pardon which angel priests can pass on to penitent men. In the type, the common priests passed on to penitent men the prayed-for pardon, before the day of atonement, before the blood was shed that was sprinkled upon the mercy-seat to make atonement for iniquity. In like manner, angel priests passed on to penitent men, the prayed-for pardon "by virtue of the all-atoning sacrifice afterwards made on Calvary," and since that day angel priests have passed on to penitent men the prayed-for pardon "by virtue of the all-atoning sacrifice," which has been slain at Calvary and has been ministered at the mercy-seat, "within the veil."

And now that it is admitted that angels "could offer the prayers of God's people before the throne," and that they are "connected with the work of the heavenly sanctuary," and "are ministering spirits to the people of God on earth," we have all the ministry from the heavenly sanctuary that is necessary to establish the teaching of the cast out ones.

HOW SALVATION WAS MINISTERED BEFORE THE CROSS

And now since we have ministering angels connected with the heavenly sanctuary, offering the prayers of God's people for pardon before the throne of God in that sanctuary, and ministering pardon to the people of God on earth, let us examine some more admissions as to what was really accomplished in saving sinners before the cross. Note the following:

The mediatorial work for sin began at the fall. As soon as man sinned, Christ interposed between God and the sinner; and ever since that time, the Son has stood as the Mediator between God and man. To mediate, according to the Standard Dictionary, is "to interpose between two parties in order to harmonize or reconcile them; act as a mutual agent or friend; intercede; arbitrate."

Here we have it admitted that Christ began to act as mediator between God and man at the fall, and "ever since that time" has been interceding with God on behalf of man. Now what did He intercede for? For the pardon of man's sin. And when Christ interceded with the Father for the pardon of the sinner "at the fall," and "ever since that time," by virtue of what did He ask pardon for the sinner? "By virtue of the all-atoning sacrifice afterward made on Calvary," the author says in our next quotation. Was Christ's intercession for the pardon of Abel's sins, "by virtue of his all-atoning sacrifice afterward made on Calvary," successful? Read the following admission:

When by faith the sinner laid hold upon the plan of salvation, outlined in the everlasting covenant that was given to Adam, and confirmed to Abraham by the promise and oath of God, each of which was immutable, forgiveness was granted and righteousness imputed. But this was done only by virtue of the all-atoning sacrifice afterward made on Calvary. A. M. E. M., page 151.

Then, through Christ's intercession with the Father on behalf of sinners from the fall onward, "forgiveness was granted, and righteousness imputed" "by virtue of His all-atoning sacrifice afterward made on Calvary."

And now read this admission:

Let none for a moment question the strength of that faithful Word that offered forgiveness and cleansing, and by which the righteousness of Christ was imputed to every believer from Adam to Christ. The blood had not yet been shed that could secure forgiveness of sin, but the promise was sure that Christ would come to earth and suffer death, that He would rise in triumph from the grave; that He would complete the plan of salvation in the heavenly sanctuary. * * * In the divine knowledge these facts were

so certain that the Son of God, anticipating the ultimate success of the plan of salvation, could, one thousand five hundred years before His blood was actually shed, call forth His servant Moses from the tomb, glorified, to ascend to the city of God. And on the strength of that same surety, Enoch and Elijah could be translated. Pp. 154, 155.

And now let us put these admissions together, and see if we do not have a ministry connected with the heavenly sanctuary *from the fall to the cross*, which ministers every spiritual blessing that has been ministered from the heavenly sanctuary since the cross.

First, Christ was the Mediator between God and the sinner "at the fall" and "ever since that time." Second, He interceded with the Father for pardon for sinners "by virtue of the all-atoning sacrifice afterward made on Calvary." Third, As the result of this intercession "forgiveness was granted," and "righteousness imputed" to the sinner. Fourth. "Before the blood was actually shed," the promise that it would be shed and offered at the mercy-seat," was so certain that the Son of God, anticipating the ultimate success of the plan of salvation, could, 1500 years before the blood was actually shed, call forth His servant Moses from the tomb, glorified, to ascend to the city of God. And on the strength of that same surety, Enoch and Elijah could be translated.

It is for believing that these gracious and glorious results were accomplished by a ministry from the heavenly sanctuary before the cross "by virtue of the all-atoning sacrifice afterward made on Calvary" that I and scores of my brethren and sisters have been cast out of the churches charged with teaching that which is "subversive of the great principles of truth underlying the great plan of salvation." A. M. E. M. p. 9.

NEITHER THE WORSHIPER NOR HIS WORSHIP TYPICAL

The fact that the earthly sanctuary was a place of worship seems to have been entirely overlooked. A worshiper is not a type, neither is his worship a type.

There may be something connected with his worship that is a type, or that is a memorial, but neither the worshiper nor his worship is a type. The blood of all the sacrifices from Abel onward, was a type of the blood of Christ. But when Abel worshiped God through the offering of his sacrifice, neither Abel nor his worship was a type of any other worshiper or worship. The blood of the grape today, used by worshipers at the communion table, is a memorial of the blood of Christ shed at Calvary. But neither the worshiper nor his act of worship is a memorial of some other worshiper and his worship.

Centuries before the typical sanctuary was built, Abel worshiped God whom he saw by faith in the true tabernacle. When Abel or Abraham offered sacrifices to God, they thereby worshiped God who dwelt in the heavenly temple. Abel was not a type of another worshiper who was to worship God in His heavenly temple thousands of years later; neither was Abel's worship a type of another worship performed centuries later. However, the blood of his offering did typify, as before stated, the blood of Christ that would be shed at Calvary.

If all men had been like Abel or Abraham, no earthly sanctuary would ever have been needed. When Abel and Abraham offered their sacrifices, and thereby worshiped God in His heavenly temple, they understood the work of ministering angels who were "connected with the work of the heavenly sanctuary." They knew that angels "could serve in the capacity of ministering spirits." They knew that "they could offer the prayers of God's people before the throne." They knew that the angels are "ministering spirits to the people of God on earth." Abraham walked, talked, and ate with angels. Jacob saw them ascending and descending between heaven and earth. And while this knowledge remained, no picture of it in a shadowy sanctuary was needed. But when Israel came out of Egypt, they had

lost sight of the heavenly sanctuary and its ministering angels. And the shadowy sanctuary with its shadowy ministry was built to help short-sighted men to see the real sanctuary which was real then, and its real ministering angels who were connected with that real sanctuary, and who were really ministering then to the people of God on earth.

When the shadowy sanctuary was built, all of Israel's worship was centered there. For 2500 years prior to the exodus, men could worship God — they could offer their offerings anywhere they might happen to be. But when the sanctuary was built, the man who should offer an offering at home (like the Patriarchs did) and should not bring it to the door of the tabernacle, was "cut off from among his people." Lev. 17:1, 10. Deut. 12:5, 6, 13, 14, 26, 27.

Nor could men now, like the Patriarchs did, offer their own sacrifices. The law of the sanctuary restricted the priesthood to the family of Aaron; and in doing this, it put a "middle man" between the worshiper and the ministering angels. Before, it was the worshiper, the ministering angels, and the throne. Now that the shadowy service has intervened, it is the worshiper, the shadowy priest, the ministering angels, and the throne. The shadowy priesthood was "imposed" upon them until the time of reformation. It was to help them see the true sanctuary and the true ministry which Abraham saw without this shadow.

Men today are in the same relation to the throne of God as was Abraham. We can worship God anywhere, and "the Father seeketh *such* to worship Him." The Samaritan woman said to Christ:

Our fathers worshiped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship.

Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. * * * But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the

Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. John 4:20, 23.

God has always sought such worshipers to worship Him, worshipers who needed not a shadowy sanctuary and a centralized worship, and middlemen or priests, to help them see the true.

After the rending of the veil at the death of Christ, every Israelite could once more, like Abraham, worship God anywhere in the world that he might happen to be, and needed no longer to make pilgrimages to Jerusalem to worship. Only 1,500 years of the 6,000 did the Lord impose upon men the burden of a middleman, the shadowy priest. Now that the shadowy middlemen have been abolished, we sustain the same relation to the throne that Abraham did before the middlemen were imposed. Once more it is the worshiper, the ministering angels, and the throne.

When the shadowy sanctuary was built, it was intended to serve two purposes.

First, It was a place where men worshiped God.

Second, It was a place where God pictured to man the plan of salvation.

All the people's worship which before was performed by the worshiper himself, anywhere he might be, was now incorporated in the services of the sanctuary, and now performed by priests, not by the people themselves, and at the sanctuary and not at the worshiper's home, as in Abraham's day. Therefore, the services of the sanctuary were, first, the people at worship; and second, God at work picturing to the worshiper the plan of salvation.

Now all must see that Abraham at worship is not a type of another man at worship centuries later. When a man today, gathers his family about him and worships God, he is not the antitype of a typical man who lived 4,000 years ago. He is a real worshiper, and so was Abraham a real worshiper. Abraham, in his worship, expressed his faith in God's salvation

by offering a sacrifice whose blood pointed to the blood of Christ. A man worships God today by offering "the sacrifice of praise to God continually," for the salvation which has been granted him through the sacrifice of Christ.

It is as essential, no more so, and no less, that we have faith in a Redeemer who has come and died our sacrifice, as it was for the ancients to believe in a Redeemer to come, whom they represented by their typical sacrifices. Sufferings of Christ, page 4.

And now that it is plain that the services of the sanctuary embraced the people's worship as well as God's picturing the plan of salvation; and since neither the people, nor the people's worship, were typical of other people or other people's worship, it follows that if we make the people and their worship types of other people and other people's worship, we make a serious mistake. And every conclusion based on that mistake, will be itself an error. And this is exactly what has been done.

Now, when worshipers came to worship at the sanctuary, they and their worship were no more types than they were when they worshiped at home before the sanctuary was built. When the worshiper came to the sanctuary, instead of offering an offering of praise or thanksgiving or prayer for pardon himself, the new middleman took his offering from him, and presented it to God in his behalf. Before the shadow was built, ministering angels took the prayer for pardon, the praise, the thanksgiving, which were voiced by his offering, and presented them before the veil in the true tabernacle. Now the middlemen take them and offer them at the earthly sanctuary.

And now a question: Did the ministering angels cease to present these prayers and thanksgivings to God in His true tabernacle when the new middlemen began to present them at the shadowy tabernacle? Of course not!

But why two ministries at the same time? Because

men were so short-sighted that they could not see the true, and to help them see it, a shadowy service was introduced at the same time that the true ministry was in progress. The worshiper was no more a shadow now, nor was his worship a shadow, any more than when the worshiper offered his sacrifice at home. Nor were the common priests, the middlemen, who offered the worshiper's offerings, a shadow of priests who would offer these offerings for these people or for any other people 1,500 years later. But they were shadows of the ministering angels who were at the same time offering these prayers before the throne in the true tabernacle.

All the offerings offered in the first apartment by the common priests were offered *for the people*, in connection with the *people's worship*. And there were no offerings offered in the first apartment that could not be offered by the common priest. The high priest could offer the offerings in the first apartment, but he need not do it, for the common priests were qualified to offer these offerings.

Now when these things were thus ordained, the *priests* went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the services of God. But into the second went the high priest alone, once every year. Heb. 9:6, 7.

The individual offering was the individual at worship, and the offering of the whole congregation was the whole congregation at worship. And whether it was the prayer for pardon of the individual or the congregation,—whether it was an individual or congregation praise offering, or prayer for pardon, ministering angels offered the prayer and praise at the throne in heaven *then*, and not a thousand years later, and brought back the comforting answer of pardon and peace *then*, and not a thousand years later, to some other worshiper of whom these worshipers were but a type.

Many offerings which were offered in the first apartment, were channels through which the sinner ex-

pressed his faith in the blood of Christ to be shed once and offered once. Many men, since the cross, have, by the symbolic bread and wine, many times expressed their faith in the one death of Christ. In like manner, many men offered many sacrifices before the cross, but all these offerings pointed to the one death of Christ. But in the type, when God would offer a sacrifice picturing from His standpoint His offering of Christ, that offering was slain but once, and offered but once in the holy of holies by the high priest alone. If the type had presented two offerings whereby God pictured the plan of salvation, one offered before the veil, one offered within the veil, then Christ must have died twice. But the offerings before the veil belong to the people's worship, by which they express faith in the one death of Christ for sins. The many priests who conducted the worship for the people, and who offered on one altar the many offerings which the many people had before offered on many altars for themselves, were not types of many priests who would offer many offerings for these many people (or for many people of whom these were types), a thousand years later. But the one high priest offering the one offering, once a year at the mercy-seat, was a type of Christ's one offering which He offered once for all at the mercy-seat.

Paul, in describing the earthly sanctuary and its services in the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, passes over the work of the *priests* in the first apartment without comment. But when he comes to the going in "alone once every year" of the high priest, he stops and dwells on the one offering, once offered by Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, until he finishes the subject of the sanctuary.

And that he is talking about the *offering* of the blood of Christ in the holy of holies, and not alone His *death* as the offering, is too plain to be denied. It does not say, "Nor yet that He should offer Himself often

as the Lord's goat died every year." That is the way it should read to fit the theory that it is talking about the death of the victim only; but this is the way it does read: "Nor yet that He should offer Himself often as the high priest *entereth into the holy place [sanctuary] every year* with the blood of others."

Here is positive proof that the "offering" of the book of Hebrews is not confined to the death of Christ, but includes Christ's offering His blood at the mercy-seat; and the only reason why an effort has ever been made to limit the term "offering" to the death of Christ, is that it was necessary to save the creed.

In the foregoing I am not saying that the blood of all the victims in the type did not typify the blood of Christ, for it did. But I am saying that they were not offered many shadowy times, by many shadowy priests, for many shadowy people, and did *not* point forward to the many real offerings of Christ's blood, many real times by many real priests for many real people many hundreds of years later. In other words, the offering of the priests on behalf of the people in connection with their worship, did not point forward to a similar work in the heavenly sanctuary performed centuries later. However, the blood, in connection with all their worship, did point forward to Christ's blood, and did express *their* faith in that blood.

Their worship by means of the blood of animal sacrifices, was a worship that was as real as ours is today, when we use the bread and wine instead of the blood of animals through which to express our faith in the blood of Christ. They offered real prayers to their real God in His real dwelling-place in heaven, through the ministry of real ministering angels who are ministers of the real sanctuary, and received real pardon from the real mercy-seat, and were real glad. "Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad."

To be sure, the blood was not *yet* shed that met the demands of the law. But neither was it shed in the

first apartment ministry in the earthly sanctuary until the day of atonement, when the high priest changed his garments, and with the blood of the Lord's goat (whom the Lord had chosen by lot for him), went within the veil and sprinkled the blood upon the mercy-seat and satisfied the demands of the law for the life of the transgressor. The postponing of this atonement for *iniquity* at the mercy-seat, until the day of atonement, while atonement for the *sinner* was going on in the first apartment, was teaching all through the centuries, that the death of Christ was postponed to the end of the ages; and the granting of pardon in the type throughout the daily ministry, before the day of atonement, was teaching that there was pardon ministered from the heavenly sanctuary, long before the death of Christ.

It therefore follows that all the services in the first apartment were connected with the people's worship, and were not shadows of things to come thousands of years later. But the shadowy priests who ministered in the shadowy sanctuary, did represent the real ministering angels who were then ministering in the true tabernacle in heaven. However, the blood of all the victims used in the people's worship did represent the blood of Christ to be shed on Calvary, and in that sense did represent the "good things to come." But the good man who offered his sacrifice, did not represent a good man to come.

When the shadowy priest presented the blood of the people's sin offering at the altar before the veil, he presented a prayer for pardon; for "the confession of sin over the head of the innocent victim did carry with it a prayer for pardon." (*A. M. E. M.*, page 99.) "By the offering of blood, the sinner acknowledged the authority of the law, confessed his guilt in transgression, and expressed his desire [his prayer] for pardon through faith in a Redeemer to come." (*Gt. Con.*, page 420.)

But this prayer for pardon offered before the veil for the sinner, by the shadowy priest, did not typify the prayer for pardon which Christ would offer centuries later for the sinner; but it did represent the prayer for pardon which the sinner offered through the ministering angel *then* at the throne in heaven, through which blood-sprinkled prayer, there was then ministering to him from the throne of grace in heaven, the prayer for pardon. And this pardon was ministered by virtue of the all-atoning blood afterward shed on Calvary, through which real blood the sinner had prayed, when he offered the shadowy blood of his victim.

THE SHADOW OF GOOD THINGS TO COME

And now that it is plain that the ministry of the first apartment of the shadow was not a type of a ministry in the first apartment of the true tabernacle carried on after the cross, but was the real worship of the people by which they worshiped God in heaven, and since the shadowy priests who offered their sacrifices in the shadowy sanctuary represented real ministering angels who were then offering the prayers of the worshipers before the throne in the true sanctuary; what was there in the earthly sanctuary service that did typify the good things to come."

There was one offering offered in the earthly sanctuary that did not represent any ministry that was then being carried on by ministering angels in the heavenly sanctuary, but did represent an offering to be made centuries later in that sanctuary. There was one offering which the common priest did not offer, and could not offer in the shadow. There was one offering which the angels did not offer and could not offer in the true sanctuary, but which the high priest, as a type of Christ, could offer, and did offer "once every year" within the veil of the shadow as a type of the death of Christ, and of His offering of His blood "once for all"

“within the veil” of the true tabernacle, centuries later. That one offering was the offering which the high priest made at the mercy-seat on the tenth day of the seventh month, and which alone satisfied, in type, the demand of the law for the life of the sinner.

This offering pictured God giving His Son to die for the world, and the presentation of His blood at the mercy-seat for the putting away of sin. The blood offered in the first apartment of the shadowy sanctuary expressed the worshiper’s faith in that blood, and brought to him, through ministering angels, the salvation that he sought by virtue of the good things to come through the shedding of that blood.

This one offering which the high priest alone offered, once every year within the veil, is the one offering which the apostle Paul uses in Hebrews as the type of the one offering, once offered by Christ as High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary when He went within the veil at His ascension. This truth is further presented on page

From this it is plain that the ministry before the veil in the typical sanctuary represented the plan of salvation as carried on before the veil in the heavenly sanctuary before the cross, and was not a type of the ministry of Christ in the first apartment from the cross to 1844. With this view, all is harmony. With the other view, all is confusion.

WHY THE THRONE DID NOT FIT THE ARK

For eight years I have tried, without success, to get the denomination to take a position as to whether in moving the throne of God from the second apartment into the first, it left the mercy-seat and ark behind and thereby divorced the throne of God from the mercy-seat and law for eighteen centuries. At last the new book has taken a position. It says:

“How fitting that this work [the work of judgment]

be carried on in the place where God's throne can rest over the sacred ark and its glorious mercy-seat!" A. M. E. M. Page 141.

As the author closes the sentence with an exclamation point, let that express both his satisfaction and my astonishment. Why was it not "fitting" that God's throne should rest over the sacred ark and its glorious mercy-seat during the preceding 1,800 years? It was "fitting" that the token of God's glory should rest above the mercy-seat in the earthly sanctuary while the ministry was performed in the first apartment, why not in the heavenly?

Come not at all times into the holy place within the veil before the mercy-seat, which is upon the ark * * * for I will appear in the cloud above the mercy-seat. Lev. 16:2.

Put the mercy-seat above upon the ark * * * and there will I meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat. Ex. 25:21, 22.

He (Moses) heard him speaking unto him from off the mercy-seat that was upon the ark of the testimony. Num. 7:89.

Above the mercy-seat and the bowed worshiping angels, dwelt the glory of the Holiest. T. C. Vol. 8, page 284.

The token of the divine presence abode upon it [the ark] day and night. S. P. page 398.

Why was it not fitting for God's throne to rest above the sacred ark, and its glorious mercy-seat, from the cross to 1844? Will some one try to give a single intelligent, Scriptural reason why it is not fitting? But why try? There is no reason that is either Scriptural or intelligent why it was not fitting for God to dwell above the sacred ark and its glorious mercy-seat from the cross to 1844, save that it would not fit the creed; and that is neither Scriptural nor intelligent.

Because I and my cast-out brethren teach that it was "fitting" for God to dwell above the sacred ark and its glorious mercy-seat from the cross to the present, as well as before, we are charged with teaching that "the Father is physically and literally confined in that apartment." (A. M. E. M., page 141.) When the author

wrote that statement, he had before him this paragraph, found on page 12, of "Cast Out":

No one, with the most rudimentary knowledge of the Scriptures would deny that God's throne is living and movable. But the question is not, is God's throne movable? but is the holy of holies in the heavenly sanctuary the center of atonement and intercession, as was taught in the type?

Reader, ought we to be charged with teaching that "the Father is physically and literally confined to that apartment" because we teach that the holy of holies is God's dwelling-place? We never taught that God did not leave His dwelling-place and retire at will. We only taught that He had a dwelling-place, and that this dwelling-place was the holy of holies; and it was the Scriptures of truth that taught us this.

We do not charge Eld. Andross with teaching that "the Father is physically and literally confined" to the first apartment because he teaches that God dwelt in that apartment for eighteen centuries. He does not teach this. He only teaches that the first apartment was God's dwelling-place for all these years. Now, if I should teach that Eld. Andross taught that God was physically and literally confined in the first apartment because Eld. A. makes that apartment God's dwelling-place from the cross to 1844, I would have to repent of the sin of misrepresenting the brother's teaching.

One may quote the dictionary definition of a throne, and refer to the king of England having more than one throne, and fill the air with the dust of human reason, but the fact still remains that there was but one throne-room in the earthly sanctuary, but one ark and mercy-seat whereon God's glory dwelt in the sanctuary. And, therefore, there is but one throne room in the heavenly sanctuary, and but one ark of the testament, and one mercy-seat, whereon God dwells in that sanctuary.

After reading this dodging and twisting to get God out of the holy of holies into the first apartment, I feel like I had just finished reading a tract teaching the

“seventh part of time” theory, against which Seventh-day Adventists have had to battle all these years. The Sabbath, we are told, is so very movable that it could be moved to any day of the week without any trouble. And what is all this talk about a “movable Sabbath” for? For no other purpose than to get it away from the day on which God placed it, to another day. And when this is accomplished, in the minds of its advocates, they then bolt it and rivet it to the first day of the week, and it becomes so very permanent and immovable that if anyone refuse to accept of this permanency, some are ready to send him to the chain-gang.

The throne of God is so very movable in the minds of the brethren, that it cannot remain where God’s Word alone puts it, in the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary. But lo! as soon as this movable theory has been worked to the extent of locating the throne in the first apartment where God never located it, then it becomes so very stationary that the brethren have no trouble keeping it there for eighteen centuries. And then by the aid of the movable theory, they are able to get it into the holy of holies again in 1844, where they have it rest over the sacred ark and its glorious mercy-seat, for nearly seventy years without any difficulty with its mobility. May God have mercy on such trifling with His Word to save a creed.

THE “RENT VEIL” AND THE “OPEN DOOR”

If that veil was then rent asunder, practically leaving but one apartment, why argue that Christ was then ministering “within the veil”? If there was no longer any veil, or only a *rent veil*, between the two apartments of the sanctuary, there is absolutely no meaning to the expression “within the veil,” * * * Christ could not have entered within a veil that was removed when He died. A. M. E. M. page 125.

There is a saying that people living in glass houses should not throw stones. Because “Cast Out” teaches that the most holy of the true sanctuary was opened,

as indicated by the rending of the veil in the earthly sanctuary, therefore it is charged, as above, that this teaching practically leaves but one apartment, and therefore the expression "within the veil," is meaningless. Eld. Andross and the denomination teach that in 1844 the door of the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary was closed and has been closed ever since. They also teach that the door between the first and second apartments was opened at the same time, and has been open ever since. And yet, they believe and teach that there are still two apartments in the heavenly sanctuary. If I should charge them with teaching that there was but one apartment since the door was opened, I would be misrepresenting their teaching. To open a door between two apartments does not make the two apartments one. While teaching that the door is open, Eld. Andross and the denomination in this new book, speak of the second apartment as "within the veil." But when the writer, who teaches that the veil was opened at the cross, uses the expression "within the veil" and applies it to the second apartment, Eld. Andross says "there is absolutely no meaning to the expression." Throughout this pamphlet the author persistently forgets one-half the creed while attempting to sustain the other half.

MEANING OF THE SEPARATING VEIL

The teaching in "Cast Out" that the separating veil between the two apartments in the heavenly sanctuary, was a "cordon of living angels" by which "for 4,000 years Christ was barred from His Father's face," is said to be "too revolting to be considered seriously."

The reason why I came to believe that the heavenly veil was a cordon of living angels, was this: I believed that the forms of angels wrought in the curtains of the walls of the shadowy tabernacle represented living angels. The author teaches that in the next sentence following the above criticism, as follows:

“Undoubtedly the forms of angels wrought in the curtains of the sanctuary represented the angels that surround the throne of God.” *A. M. E. M.* p. 131.

Now since this is true of the curtains of the walls, why is it not true of the veil that separated the holy from the most holy? The veil, like the wall curtains, had forms of angels wrought in it. Undoubtedly these forms also represented angels. And since the Lord said “The veil shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy” (Ex. 26:33), I decided that in heaven there must be a cordon of living angels stretched across between the holy and the most holy, to divide between the holy and the most holy, as the antitype of the angels on the veil of the type. Is this conclusion “too revolting to be considered seriously?”

Again, is it too revolting to be considered seriously that the sin-bearing substitute in the type was separated from the immediate presence of God by the veil? If not in the type, is it too revolting to be considered in the antitype? And did sin separate the Son from the Father?

On page 148 the author says this in a quotation:

Christ would take upon Himself the guilt and shame of sin,—sin so offensive to a holy God that it must separate the Father and His Son. “Patriarchs and Prophets,” page 63.

Then it is not “too revolting to be considered” that the sins of men were so offensive to a holy God that they separated the Father and His Son. But when did Christ begin to be the substitute for sinners? On page 155 the author says this through another quotation:

Not alone at the Saviour’s advent, but through all the ages after the fall and the promise of redemption, “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. “Patriarchs and Prophets,” page 366.

How did God in Christ reconcile the world unto Himself from the fall to the advent of Christ? Let the Scriptures answer:

God was in Christ, [from the fall onward] reconciling the

world unto Himself, NOT IMPUTING THEIR TRESPASSES UNTO THEM. 2 Cor. 5:19.

Since God in Christ, from the fall, reconciled men to Himself by not imputing their trespasses unto them, to whom did He impute their trespasses? For sin must be imputed either to the sinner or to his substitute. And since God did not impute sin to the sinner, He must have imputed it to the sinner's substitute, His Son. And that is what the next verse but one, says He did. Read them together:

God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself [from the fall] not imputing their trespasses unto them.
* * * For He hath made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin.

And now since God reconciled men to Himself from the fall, by not imputing their trespasses unto them, but by imputing them unto His Son whom He made sin for us, is it too revolting to consider that God imputed man's sin to His Son from the fall onward? And since we are agreed that sin is "so offensive to a holy God, that it must separate the Father and His Son," is it too revolting to consider that the sins of men which God imputed to His Son from the fall onward, in the work of reconciling the world to Himself, would separate God and His Son? And since in the type the one to whom sin was imputed, was separated from the symbol of the Father by a veil wrought with angel forms, is it not reasonable to believe that the one to whom God imputed sin from the fall, was separated from Himself by a veil of living angels?

However, veils are not used to separate the sin-bearer *far* from God, but to separate between them, in order that the sin-bearer may *come near*. Moses put a veil on his face to veil the glory that the people might come near. Ex. 34:30, 35. Christ veiled His Divinity in humanity that men might come near to Him and recline upon His bosom. John 1:14; 13:23; 1 John 1:1.

And the veil in the earthly sanctuary was not to bar the sin-bearing substitute from coming close to God,

but to separate him from God's consuming glory, while he drew near that glory. Nor was the living veil in the true tabernacle for the purpose of barring the sinner's Substitute *far* from His Father, but to separate the sin-bearer from God's immediate presence, while the Son came near and communed with Him, until that day when He should carry the imputed sins to the cross and unload them in His death. Then the living veil can open like the linen veil was torn, and let the returning Son come home, not to the angel veil only, but to the waiting arms of His loving Father. Then was fulfilled this prayer of the Son that He might come home to His Father, and take the place by His side that was His before sin separated them,—before the foundation of the world.

And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was. John 17:5.

And now do Thou honor me, Father, at Thy own side, with the glory which I had beside Thee before the world began. John 17:5 "Twentieth Century."

TO MAKE ATONEMENT FOR INIQUITY

Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to MAKE RECONCILIATION FOR INIQUITY and to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy. Dan. 9:24.

In "Cast Out" the writer taught that the expression "atonement for iniquity" referred to the atonement made by Christ in His ascension when He went "within the veil" and sprinkled His blood upon the mercy-seat, to satisfy the demands of the law. The remark was made that the term "reconciliation" is from the same Hebrew word from which the word "atonement" is translated as used when describing the work of atonement performed on the tenth day of the seventh month. The author of the book under review replies that the same word is also used in describing the work wrought

in the first apartment of the sanctuary. He comments thus: "Is it a safe position to take, to assume, as does the author of "Cast Out" that in this instance the word refers to a work wrought in the most holy place only, and upon this assumption to build a theory?" A. M. E. M., page 192.

The term applies either to the work wrought in the first apartment or in the second; and it is not difficult to determine which. It is an "atonement for iniquity" made within the seventy weeks. Therefore before the seventy weeks are ended, this "atonement for iniquity" is made. The author cannot apply it to the atonement work of the first apartment, because according to his teaching, that atonement continues from the cross to 1844. But this scripture is speaking of an atonement for the iniquity that is made within the seventy weeks. It was in the midst of the last of the seventy weeks that Christ bore our sins in His own body on the tree, and then went "within the veil" of the heavenly sanctuary in the presence of God for us, and sprinkled His atoning blood upon the mercy-seat, and "received from God Himself the assurance that His atonement for the sins of His people had been full and ample."

And "after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God."

While this in itself is sufficient proof that the scripture refers to the atonement-day atonement, there is conclusive proof found in the expression itself. The scripture calls for an atonement for INIQUITY to be made within the seventy weeks, and there was no atonement for iniquity ever made in the first apartment. The atonement made in the first apartment was made for the *sinner*, and *not* for his *sins*.

This is the form of expression constantly used to describe the atonement of the sinner during the daily service. And this the author admits when he declares that the blood of the sinner's offering cleansed the sinner, and the blood of the Lord's goat cleansed the sanc-

tuary from the sins that defile it. The more than fifty times that the expression in some form is used in describing the work of the holy place, one text (Lev. 4:33), would seem to be out of harmony with the rest, but by examining the original, it is found to be in harmony with the other scriptures in which form it is translated by the Revised Version, and the American Standard.

Therefore, since there was no atonement made for iniquity in the ministry before the veil, and since there was an atonement made for iniquity within the veil on the day of atonement, it infallibly follows that the "atonement for iniquity" made within the seventy weeks, must refer to the atonement for iniquity which Christ made when He died on the cross and offered that death on our behalf within the veil. "But this man after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God. . . . For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. Now where remission of these is, [the sins mentioned in the New Covenant which are now remembered no more] there is no more offering for sin." Heb. 10:12-18.

In this connection the author gives utterance to this remarkable statement, "reconciliation was made on the cross, while the atonement is made within the sanctuary." The effort to make a distinction between reconciliation and atonement is necessary with his theory, because if reconciliation is allowed to mean what it really does mean, then his whole case is lost. For the New Testament repeatedly speaks of reconciliation as something accomplished. If the reader has any good dictionary, let him consult the meaning of the two words, and he will find that each is a synonym for the other. The translators of both the Old and the New Testaments used the words interchangeably. Anyone ought to know that if two parties are not *at one*, they

are alienated; and when a state of at-one-ment is accomplished, reconciliation is accomplished.

But we need not stop with the evident meaning of the words; there is an infallible proof that it is unscriptural for him or anyone else to limit either of the terms to the death of the sacrificial victim *alone*. The atonement was not yet complete while the victim lay dead at the sinner's feet. Before the priest could say he had made atonement or reconciliation for the sinner, he must first offer the blood.

And the priest shall take of the blood thereof with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering. * * * And the priest shall make an atonement for him and it shall be forgiven him. Lev. 4:30, 32.

Therefore this effort to keep Christ from making atonement for iniquity at the mercy-seat within the veil, until 1844, by confining the term atonement for iniquity to the death of the antitypical victim, is shown to be contrary to a "thus saith the Lord." True, Rom. 5:10 says "We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son." But this statement includes the presentation of the evidence of that death to God at the mercy-seat, as is repeatedly shown in chapters nine and ten of the epistle to the Hebrews.

But while the atonement both in type and antitype includes the presentation of the offering in the sanctuary, let no one gather from the foregoing that the writer does not believe and teach that the atonement in reality was made on the cross. No "chief of sinners," saved by grace, must ever be allowed to excel this poor man in magnifying the cross of Christ. "It is the BLOOD that maketh an atonement for the soul." Lev. 17:11. "For the blood is the life." Deut. 12:23.

When the blood was shed, the life was taken, hence the blood represented the DEATH of the victim. Therefore it is DEATH that maketh atonement for the soul.

In both type and antitype, it is the death of a sub-

stitute that makes atonement. If the blood had been the blood of the transgressor himself, there could be no question about his death satisfying the law. In the plan of salvation, it is the blood (death) of the SUBSTITUTE that is offered in the place of the death of the transgressor. And all must admit that the death of the substitute does make atonement for the sinner, *providing the Father will accept the death of His Son in the place of the death of the sinner*. But this question was settled before the foundation of the world. 2 Tim. 1:9. It was God who provided man's substitute. It was God who laid the sins of the world on man's substitute. The very fact that Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father is proof that His death was accepted in the place of the death of the sinner, and that His death therefore did make atonement for sin.

While the Scriptures plainly declare that like as the high priest entered once into the holy of holies and offered once; so Christ entered in once and offered once; it was not the *offering* of His blood, death, that made atonement for sin, but it was His DEATH that made the atonement.

Before the reader pronounces this to be heresy, let him ponder the following from his own law:

Through the shed blood, he (Abel) looked to the future sacrifice, Christ dying on the cross of Calvary; and trusting in the ATONEMENT that was THERE TO BE MADE, he had the witness that he was righteous and his offering accepted. Patriarchs and Prophets, chap. 5, par. 6.

He (Christ) ascended to the heavenly courts and from God Himself heard the announcement that His ATONEMENT for the sins of men HAD BEEN AMPLE.—Desire of Ages. Chap. 82, par. 9.

A NEW INVENTION

For over sixty years Seventh-day Adventists have taught that Christ began His ministry in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary at His ascension, and from that time to 1844 He defiled the heavenly sanc-

tuary by sprinkling His "sin-laden" blood there. And they have taught that from 1844 to the present time He has been engaged in cleansing the sanctuary from the defilement of that sin-laden blood by sprinkling His blood upon the mercy-seat in the second apartment.

For eight years I have been asking the denomination how Christ could cleanse the sanctuary from the defilement sprinkled upon it in His "sin-laden blood" by sprinkling upon it more "sin-laden blood."

To meet this question, a new theory has been invented and presented in this new book. It is something unknown to the pioneers. Briefly stated it is, that Christ's blood as the antitype of the blood of the sin-offering sprinkled in the first apartment of the sanctuary, was laden with the sins of the sinner, and defiled the sanctuary, from the cross to 1844. And that Christ's blood as the antitype of the Lord's goat, upon whose head no human hands were laid, was sinless. Therefore Christ's sinless blood since 1844, has cleansed the sanctuary from the defilement of His "sin-laden blood" sprinkled upon it from the cross to 1844. This is published as an answer to my question. And now let us study it.

The reason given why the blood of the Lord's goat was "sinless" is that no hands were laid upon him, and therefore no sins confessed over him. But the fact that no hands were laid upon the Lord's goat, when properly understood, proves that for this very reason it did represent Christ as the sin-bearer.

Reader, who laid the sins of men upon Christ the great sin-bearer? "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquities of us all." Isa. 53:6. It was the Father who laid the sins of men upon His Son, the anti-typical Lord's goat; and there was no man in the type who represented God. The high priest represented Christ, the common priests represented the ministering angels; but no man represented God. He was represented by the glory above the mercy-seat. Therefore, had any man

laid hands on the Lord's goat, he would have ruined it as a type of the great sin-bearer of the plan of salvation, upon whose head God, not man, laid the iniquities of us all.

Hence, the evidence given by the author, to prove that the Lord's goat represented Christ as the sinless sacrifice, proves that it represents Christ upon whom God, not man, laid the sins of men. No man ever did or ever will, lay his sins upon Christ. God alone did this. And men's sins need to be laid upon the Sin-bearer but once.

The Israelite who confessed his sin over the head of his victim, thereby accepted Christ as his substitute, and sinbearer, upon whose head God, not the Israelite, laid the iniquities of us all. The sinner since the cross, confesses his sins and by faith accepts Christ as his substitute upon whose head God laid his sins and who bore them in His own body on the tree. But the sinner cannot now place his sins upon Christ, for God has already done that, and it cannot be done a second time. "In that He died, he died unto sin once." "He that is dead is freed from sin." Rom. 6:10, 8.

The Father laid the sins of every child of Adam born into the world from creation to the second coming, on His Son the great Sin-bearer; and He suffered under them once on Calvary, and paid the price in His death.

That He by the grace of God should taste death for every man. Heb. 2:9.

And He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world. 1 John 2:2.

Who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those who believe. 1 Tim. 4:10.

As man's substitute and surety, the iniquity of men was laid upon Christ; He was counted a transgressor that He might redeem them from the curse of the law. The guilt of every descendant of Adam of every age was pressing upon His heart; and the wrath of God and the terrible manifestation of His displeasure because of iniquity, filled the soul of His Son with consternation. *Spirit of Prophecy*, vol. 3, page 162.

This load of sin was upon Christ unrealized and unrepented of by man. *Sufferings of Christ, page 14.*

Therefore, the Lord laid upon Christ the iniquities of every descendant of Adam. He laid upon him sins "unrealized and unrepented of by man." And since this is the truth in the antitype, it must appear in the type. For the type was a shadow of the good things of the antitype. Where in the type, do we find a victim who bore the sins of "*all the people of the congregation?*" Where in the type do we find an offering whose blood was shed for all, and sprinkled for all on the mercy-seat, and which made atonement "for all the people of the congregation?" Where do we find a victim who bore sins "unrealized and unrepented of by man?" There was but one such offering in the type, and that offering was the Lord's goat which according to the Scriptures, made atonement for "all the people of the congregation." "And he shall make an atonement for *all* the people of the congregation." Lev. 16:33.

Sinners in the type were not cut off because there was no sacrifice provided for them, nor because there was no blood shed for them, nor because there was no blood sprinkled upon the mercy-seat for them, nor because that blood did not make atonement for them, for it did. It made "an atonement for all the people of the congregation."

In like manner, no sinner will ever be lost, because God did not provide for him a sacrifice; nor because God did not lay upon that sacrifice the sins of that sinner, for He did; nor because the blood of that sacrifice was not shed for his sins, for it was; nor because that blood was not sprinkled upon the mercy-seat to make atonement for him, for it was; but because he neglected so great salvation, because he counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified as an unholy thing.

God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; * * * For He

hath made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin. 2 Cor. 5:19, 21.

We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son.
* * * Therefore as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto the justification of life. Rom. 5:10, 18.

That the Lord's goat did not represent Christ as the Sin-bearer of the world, is a new invention; and is contrary, not only to the Scriptures, but to the teachings of the denomination; for the denomination does teach in its books that the Lord's goat did represent Christ as sin-bearer. In the back part of this book which advocates this new theory, there is advertised another book on the sanctuary, entitled, "Christ Our Advocate." On page 29 of that book we find this:

This goat [the Lord's goat] must typify Christ, the lamb of God, who died for our sins. He is the great sin-offering "for the people." He bore our sins in His own body on the tree. 1 Pet. 1:24.

Again in the Sabbath School Quarterly for the first quarter of 1895, Lesson 8, questions 16 and 17, we have the following:

16. Of whom was the goat for the Lord a type?—Christ. He was the goat for the Lord (Lev. 16:8, 9), or to represent the Lord.

17. When and how did Christ fulfill the type? Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree. 1 Pet. 2:24.

Again, in the "Bible Reading Gazette," published by resolution of the General Conference in 1883, in which appear "the cardinal features of the doctrines held by S. D. Adventists," we find the Lord's goat presented as the type of Christ who shall "bear their iniquities." Isa. 53:11 is quoted to prove this position. See page 186, questions 81, 82.

On page 99, of A. M. E. M., the author says "*We do not teach*" that the sanctuary was cleansed with sin-laden blood. "Such a statement of our position is based on a serious misunderstanding." (Italics mine).

Who are "we," and whose position is "our position"?

“Our position” that the Lord’s goat was not a sin-bearer, and that its blood was “sinless” blood, was not invented when “Cast Out” was written. The denomination was then teaching that the Lord’s goat represented Christ as the sin-bearer, as proven by the foregoing quotations; but this new theory that He was not, was not yet born. How could “Cast Out” misrepresent “our position” when “our position” was not yet born? “Cast Out” did represent “our position” faithfully as it was taught by the denomination when it was written, and as it is still taught in “Christ Our Savior” advertised in this new book which teaches the new and contrary teaching.

WHICH CLEANSSES: THE BLOOD OF THE SIN-BEARER, OR THE BLOOD OF THE SINLESS ONE?

Now let us study to see whether it is the blood of the sin-bearer or the sinless one that satisfies the demands of the broken law. “The wages of sin is death.” Death to whom? Death to the sinner, of course. It is not the death of an innocent man that the law demands, but the death of the law-breaker, the sinner. This truth is told in the following scripture:

Whoso killeth any person, the murderer shall be put to death. * * * So ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are: for blood it defileth the land: and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein but *by the blood of him that shed it.* Num. 35:30, 33.

The scripture proves that it is the blood of the guilty one, the blood of the sin-bearer that cleanses, that satisfies the demands of the law. The sin of murder (shedding innocent blood), defiles, and this defilement can only be cleansed by the blood of the guilty one.

The author, in this new theory, shows himself to be ignorant of this primary principle in the plan of salvation. He has the sanctuary defiled by sin-laden blood, while the Scriptures teach that it is the shedding of innocent blood that defiles. Then, he has the sanctuary cleansed with innocent blood, whereas the Scriptures teach that it is the blood of the guilty one

that cleanses. Let us illustrate this primary truth. The high priest, we will say, comes to the mercy-seat with the blood of an innocent victim, and the following conversation takes place:

High Priest: I have come to satisfy the demands of the law for the life of the transgressor. What will satisfy the law's demands?

The Law: Nothing but the blood (which is the life) of the sinner. The wages of sin is death. What have you to offer? Is the blood which you bring the blood of the sinner? And have you brought this blood to offer as evidence that the law-breaker, the sinner, is dead?

High Priest: No. This is not the blood of the sin-bearer. This is the blood of a sinless one.

The Law: Why bring the blood of a sinless one to cleanse away sin? The sanctuary cannot be cleansed from the sins which defile it, but by the blood of the sinner or one bearing his sins. The shedding of innocent blood only adds to the sins already committed.

By this it is seen that only the blood of Christ as the sin-bearer in place of the sinner, can cleanse the sanctuary; and that Christ's blood is regarded as the blood of the sin-bearer, is clearly taught in this scripture:

God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. * * * For He hath made Him to be sin for us. 2 Cor. 5:19, 21.

This gospel truth has been taught by the denomination for sixty years prior to this new invention, as shown by the following:

[Christ] offers Himself on the cross as the last sacrifice for man. He, the sin-bearer, endures judicial punishment for iniquity, and becomes sin itself for man.—*Spirit of Prophecy, Vol. 3, page 163.*

The sins of the world were upon Him. He felt that He was separated from His Father's love; for upon Him rested the curse because of sin.—*Sufferings of Christ, page 13.*

His burden of guilt was so great because of man's transgression of His Father's law, that human nature was inadequate to bear it.—*Id. 316.*

The sin of the world with all its terribleness, was felt to the utmost by the Son of God. The displeasure of the Father for sin, and its penalty which was death, were all that He could realize through the amazing darkness.—*Id.* page 25.

These quotations give some idea of how really Christ became the sinner, and how really His death was the death of the sinner, and how really His blood was the blood of the sin-bearer, and it was this blood, the blood of the sin-bearer, sprinkled upon the mercy-seat, that satisfies the demands of the law for the death of the sinner.

From all this it is evident that the new theory that the atonement for a world was made at the mercy-seat by the blood of one who was counted innocent, is contrary to the teaching of the denomination, contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures, and contrary to the very first principles in the Divine plan of salvation.

DOES BLOOD REPRESENT SIN?

Before leaving this subject, let me further expose the fallacy that blood carried sin into the sanctuary. There is no such expression as "sin-laden" blood to be found in the Scriptures. Neither is there any proof that blood carried sin. The Scriptures say "the blood is the life." Deut. 12:23. "The life of all flesh is the blood thereof." Num. 17:13.

When the blood is taken from the victim, its life is taken. Therefore the blood is evidence of life taken, or death. "The wages of sin is death." Therefore blood satisfied the demands of the law, because the blood was evidence that the transgressor was dead. The terms "blood" and "death" are used interchangeably, in Rom. 5:9, 10.

There is no more reason for believing that the sins confessed over the victim went into his blood than for believing that they went into his brain, or his bronchial tubes. The idea that sin ran out of the victim in his blood is unreasonable. Blood does not carry sin. It cleanses sin. Not by washing it out of the vic-

tim, and conveying it to the sanctuary, but by proving the death of the sinner. It is death, shedding of blood, that cleanses. Blood is but the symbol of death, and it is the death of the sinner or his substitute that cleanses sin away. "Without the shedding of blood (death) there is no remission."

Returning to Num. 33:35, we read, "For blood [the blood of the murdered man] defileth the land." It was not because the blood was sin-laden that it defiled the land, for the blood here spoken of, was not sin-laden, for it was the blood of an innocent man who had been killed by a murderer. Here we have it stated that the blood of an innocent man defiled the land. The author teaches that it is only the blood of a sin-bearer that defiles the sanctuary. But here we have it stated that the blood of the innocent man, the man who was slain by the guilty man, defiles the land. This scripture next states that the blood of the sin-bearer, the blood of the murderer, cleanses the land. "And the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it."

Therefore it is the blood of the sin-bearer that cleanses the land and the sanctuary, and not the blood of the innocent one. And here is where Eld. Andross squarely contradicts the Word. God says the blood of the sinless victim defiles. Eld. Andross says it cleanses. God says the blood of the guilty one, the sin-bearer, cleanses. But Eld. Andross says, No; it defiles.

If the man had died naturally, or accidentally, his blood would not have been spoken of as defiling the land. It was because he had been murdered, and it was the act of murder that defiled the land. If he had been strangled, and not a drop of blood had been shed, still the land would have been defiled. The blood is used to represent the slaying of the man, to represent the act of murder, to represent his death, and it is the act of murder that defiled the land.

The author has tried to find scripture evidence that the blood carries sin, in order to get Divine support for his theory that the sanctuary was defiled with blood. And to do this, he has quoted several scriptures, with this introduction:

"That blood is often used in the Scriptures to represent sin, is apparent by a brief study of certain passages. A. M. E. M., page 179.

The first scripture quoted is Pilate's statement to the Jews concerning the death of Christ, and their reply.

I am innocent of the blood of this just person. * * *
His blood be on us and on our children. Matt. 27:24, 25.

Let the reader substitute "sin" for "blood" in these statements, and see how they will read.

I am innocent of the "sin" of this just person. * * *
His "sin" be on us and on our children.

Pilate did not desire to say, I am innocent of this man's sin; neither did the Jews desire to say, His sin be on us and on our children.

Then what is meant by these statements? Simply this: I am innocent of the killing of this just man. The crucifying of this man be on us. That is, the responsibility of this man's blood (his death) be on us.

The next scripture used to prove that the sin-bearer's blood carries sin, is the following:

If one be found slain in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it, lying in the field, and it be not known who hath slain him: * * * all the elders of that city, that are next unto the slain man, shall wash their hands over the heifer that was beheaded in the valley: and they shall answer and say, Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Be merciful, O Lord, unto thy people Israel, whom thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood unto thy people of Israel's charge. And the blood shall be forgiven them. So shalt thou put away the guilt of innocent blood from among you. Deut. 21:1, 6-9.

But you ask, How does this scripture prove his position? That is what I have been wondering. Why he should ever use this scripture to support his position

that the blood of the sin-bearer defiles the sanctuary, is beyond comprehension.

Bear in mind that the author teaches that it is only the sin-bearer's blood that carries sin, that defiles the sanctuary. He does not believe that the blood of a sinless one bears sin, or defiles. And remember he is quoting this scripture to prove that the blood of a sin-laden victim defiles the sanctuary.

But this scripture tells the Israelites how they shall "put away the GUILT of INNOCENT BLOOD from among" them. It was the shedding of innocent blood in the land that brought guilt upon the land. This scripture squarely contradicts the theory which it is quoted to support. The author must find scriptures that teach that the blood of the *guilty* one, the sin-bearer, defiles the land, to sustain his theory. But there are no such scriptures to be found.

The last scriptures quoted to sustain the theory are the words of Paul to the Jews at Corinth, and to the elders at Ephesus.

Your blood be upon your own heads. I am clean. Acts 18:6.

Wherefore, I take you to record this day, that I am free from the blood of all men. Acts 20:26.

Now reader, If a man had no theory to support, and was only seeking for truth, what would these scriptures teach him? Would it not be this: Your blood (your death), be upon your heads; I am clean? And, I am free from the blood (death) of all men? Inasmuch as he had faithfully warned the people of the results of rejecting the truth if they should at last perish as the result of that rejection, responsibility for their blood, their death, would be upon their own heads, and Paul would be free.

And now after all that can be said has been said, in favor of the theory that sin-laden blood defiled the sanctuary, and sinless blood cleanses the sanctuary, it still remains a fact that the blood that cleanses at the mercy-seat, the blood that satisfies the demands of the

law for the life of the sin-bearer, is the blood of the sinner and not the blood of the sinless one. It therefore follows that this new invention that atonement for iniquity is made with sinless blood, fails utterly to answer my question, which I ask again: If the sanctuary was defiled by sin-laden blood, how could it be cleansed by sprinkling upon it more sin-laden blood?

THE NEW INVENTION CLOSES PROBATION IN 1844

One of the most surprising things about this new theory is that it was able to pass the denomination's proof-readers, much more the denomination's Book Committee, without its being discovered that the theory closed the probation of the whole human race in 1844. Let the reader examine the following quotations and he will quickly see that this charge is true:

The daily offerings typified Christ as the sin-bearer; the Lord's goat, slain on the day of atonement, prefigured Christ as the sinless one. As such His blood can cleanse the sanctuary from the sins of His people. It requires the blood of the spotless Lamb of God to blot sins from the judgment books. A. M. E. M., page 95.

Note carefully the significant fact that no hands were laid upon the head of the Lord's goat, and no sins were confessed over it. When this goat was offered, there were no sins to be transferred to the sanctuary; all [sins] for which atonement was to be made were already resting there. * * * The last offering for the cleansing of the sinner and the transference of the sin to the sanctuary has now been made. The time has come for the sins of Israel for the entire year to be brought out of that sacred place; it is to be cleansed of its iniquity. And this can only be accomplished by the blood of a victim that is sinless upon which no sin had been confessed. Id. page 94.

And the only sins from which the sanctuary was cleansed on the day of atonement, were those that had been carried in through repentance and confession, and by means of a substitute. Ib. page 106.

These quotations teach:

First, The daily offering typified Christ as the sin-bearer.

Second, The Lord's goat, slain on the day of atonement, pre-figured Christ as the sinless one.

Third, The blood of the sin-bearing victim defiles the sanctuary.

Fourth, The blood of the sinless victim cleanses the sanctuary.

Fifth, When the Lord's goat was offered on the day of atonement "there were no sins to be transferred to the sanctuary."

Sixth, "All (the sins) for which atonement was to be made were already resting there."

Seventh, "The only sins from which the sanctuary was cleansed on the day of atonement, were those that had been carried in," before the high priest entered the holy of holies.

Eighth, "The last offering for the cleansing of the sinner and the transference of his sin to the sanctuary, has now been made."

Ninth, When the high priest entered the holy of holies, every man was lost whose sins were not already resting there.

Tenth, The blood of the sin-bearer cannot cleanse the sanctuary.

Eleventh, The blood of the sinless victim cannot cleanse the sinner.

THE NEW INVENTION APPLIED

First, Christ, with his sinful blood, defiled the sanctuary from His ascension to October 22, 1844.

Second, Christ has been cleansing the sanctuary with His sinless blood ever since that day.

Third, When Christ entered the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary, Oct. 22, 1844, "all [the sins] for which atonement was to be made were already resting there."

Fourth, The only sins from which the sanctuary is now to be cleansed on the day of atonement are

“those that have been carried in” by Christ before He entered the holy of holies in 1844.

Fifth, “The last offering for the cleansing of the sinner and the transference of his sin to the sanctuary has now been made.”

Sixth, The sin-laden blood which Christ sprinkled in the first apartment until 1844 could save the sinner, but could not cleanse the sanctuary.

Seventh, The sinless blood which Christ sprinkled upon the mercy-seat since 1844, can cleanse the sanctuary, but cannot save the sinner.

Eighth, Therefore all sinners who have sinned since Christ entered the holy of holies in 1844, and closed the door of the first apartment, are hopelessly lost.

And this theory which plunges the whole human race into blackness of darkness, into hopeless despair, since 1844, is called “much light” in the preface of the book. And how serious is the condition of a people who call darkness light. “If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness.” Let not the author’s brethren condemn him too severely for this fatal blunder. He is only trying to save the denomination from another fatal error that was in the creed before he was born. That error is that the heavenly sanctuary was defiled by the sin-laden blood of Christ. He was trying to answer my question, which is, How could the heavenly sanctuary be defiled with Christ’s sin-laden blood and then cleansed from that defilement by sprinkling upon it of more sin-laden blood?

To save the creed from this dilemma, he invented the sin-laden and sinless blood theory, which, in his short-sightedness, seemed to solve the problem, but which in reality deepens the dilemma. It plunges the whole human race, for the last sixty-eight years, into hopeless despair. But let those leaders who will be tempted to condemn the brother for this fatal error, first find a better solution of the difficulty. And when you fail, brethren, take your Bibles and prayerfully

examine again the position which you have condemned, as presented in "Cast Out For the Cross of Christ," which presents a scriptural position involving none of these fatal errors. Do it, Brethren, For the Truth's sake, do it.

When the school-boy makes a mistake in multiplying at the beginning of his problem, all results based on that mistake are incorrect. When the Bible student makes a mistake in his understanding of the plan of salvation, all conclusions based on that mistake, are incorrect. This is illustrated in the theory examined in the preceding chapter. That error made it necessary to find sinless blood by which to cleanse the sanctuary. That error led to the next, which was that the blood of a sinless substitute satisfies the law. And this error led to the next, that Christ ministers only His sinless blood in the second apartment on behalf of the sins which He had already transferred there in His sin-laden blood. And this error results in closing probation when Christ enters the holy of holies, which the denomination teaches occurred in 1844.

TO ANOINT THE MOST HOLY

The author devotes much space to proving that the term "most holy" of Dan. 9:24 applies to the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary. And having accomplished this to his satisfaction, he slyly slips the term over the whole sanctuary, in order to make the scripture help him prove that at Christ's ascension he performed a ceremony of anointing God's holy dwelling-place that it might be holy. If the term applies to the sanctuary, it applies to the second apartment, and not to the whole sanctuary.

As all heavenly anointing is with the Holy Spirit, no fault will be found with the author's connecting this anointing with the Pentecostal baptism. But fault will be found with the teaching of the book, that the Pentecostal baptism was given as evidence that Christ was

thereby made high priest, and that all His offerings as High Priest, were beyond this baptism.

Here, (Acts 2:1-4, the pouring out of the spirit on the day of Pentecost), we have the antitype of what occurred when the first offering was presented in the earthly sanctuary.—A. M. E. M., page 58.

But the sanctuary was not dedicated on the day of Pentecost. Pentecost came on the sixth day of the third month, while the sanctuary was dedicated and occupied on the first few days of the first month. The services therefore, in the type, had been in progress two months when Pentecost was reached. It therefore follows, that the pouring out of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, was not the antitype of what occurred when the first offering was presented in the earthly sanctuary.

But was the Pentecostal baptism the announcement that services on behalf of sinners had only just begun in the heavenly sanctuary? Let us see what this means. When the sanctuary was dedicated, and the first offering offered, there lay before the priests a long series of offerings. Did the Pentecostal baptism announce that Christ had offered only the first of a long series of offerings extending over eighteen centuries? No indeed! But the Spirit did announce that the last offering which Christ would ever offer for sin had been offered.

But this man after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.

The pouring out of the Spirit was the announcement that Christ was glorified at His Father's right hand; but before He sat down at His Father's right hand, He offered one sacrifice for sins forever. The Pentecostal baptism was, therefore, the announcement that the LAST and only offering for sin had been offered, and not the first of many millions which He would offer during 1,800 years.

In the type the first apartment ministry was a ministry of sin-bearing; of separation from the token of the Divine presence. To enter within the veil was death.

Did the Pentecostal baptism announce that Christ had taken this position of sin-bearing and separation from the presence of His Father after He had unloaded a world's sins in His death on the cross? Nay, verily. For the Word says "When He had by Himself purged our sins, He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High." But the reply will come quickly, We do not teach that Christ was separated from the Father during His ministry in the first apartment, like the priests were separated from God's glory by a veil, in the type. We believe that God's throne was moved away from the ark into the first apartment, and that Christ, contrary to the type, performed His first-apartment ministry in the immediate presence of His Father.

Was the Pentecostal baptism, then, the announcement that God had just abandoned the ark and law, and taken up His abode "without the veil," there to dwell for 1,800 years? God forbid.

Since the Pentecostal baptism announced that Christ was glorified (John 7:39) exalted to the right hand of God (Acts 2:33; 5:31, 32) where He was given all power in heaven and earth; did the Spirit announce that all this was realized eighteen centuries before Christ had satisfied the demands of the law at the mercy-seat for His life, as the sinner's substitute?

The Holy Ghost was originally given to proclaim the glorious good news of salvation accomplished, and the long expected "latter rain" will not be realized while this truth which it was given to proclaim, is rejected and opposed.

And now since the denomination believes and teaches that the Spirit was given to proclaim these errors,

may not this fact explain why it has waited in vain for nearly seventy years for the "latter rain?"

But what of the progress of our missionary work? Are we not proclaiming the truth to every nation under heaven? But no amount of missionary effort can offset the rejection of truth. At the very time when the Jewish church had "devout men" in "every nation under heaven" (Acts 2:5); when its missionary zeal led it to "compass sea and land to make one proselyte" to the "truth," it rejected and crucified THE TRUTH.

And now in closing, let me plead with the reader to diligently search the Scripture for himself.

No mortal man or woman today, is commissioned to be the door-keeper of the treasure-house of truth. If God ever gave the "keys" to any visible church, He has taken it from them.

"These things saith He that is holy, He that is true, He that hath the key of David, He that openeth, and NO MAN shutteth; and shutteth, and NO MAN openeth:
Behold, I have set before thee an open door, and NO MAN can shut it." Rev. 3:7.

There is no "shut door" announced in this scripture, but, thank the Lord, there is an "OPEN DOOR"—open to every honest searcher for truth,—a door that NO MAN can shut.

No man should claim that he has all the light there is for God's people. The Lord will not tolerate this. He has said, "I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it." (Rev. 3:8). Even if all our leading men should refuse light and truth, that door will still remain open. The Lord will raise up men who will give the people the message for this time. *Gospel Workers*, page 126.

And now as I go forth to tell the story of redeeming love, let this be my testimony:

"Where e'er I go I'll tell the story of the cross, of the cross;
In nothing else my soul shall glory, save the cross, save the cross;

And this my constant theme shall be, thro' time and in eternity,

That Jesus shed His blood for me, on the cross, on the cross."

